

DELAWARE.

W. S. Alexander, Elsmere.

ILLINOIS.

Hugh Hall, Litchfield.

PENNSYLVANIA.

George B. Kirk, South Brownsville.

Daniel H. Sutton, East Butler.

Jessie R. Wilson, St. Benedict.

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

FRIDAY, January 12, 1917.

The House met at 11 o'clock a. m.

The Chaplain, Rev. Henry N. Couden, D. D., offered the following prayer:

O Lord God, our Heavenly Father, encourage us in every thought and act looking to the betterment of life and all its conditions by Thy holy influence; and discourage every adverse thought and act, that we may not dissipate our energies in useless or harmful purposes. And help us, we beseech Thee, to bear with patience the weakness and infirmities of others as we desire Thee to bear with patience our weakness and infirmities; for what hurts one, hurts all; what helps one, helps all; so delicately hast Thou woven the fabric which binds us together into one family. Hence the admonition, "Bear ye one another's burdens, and so fulfill the law of Christ." Amen.

The Journal of the proceedings of yesterday was read and approved.

EXTENSION OF REMARKS.

Mr. PARK. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting an article containing information relating to the pecan industry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Georgia asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD by inserting an article containing information on the pecan industry. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

MESSAGE FROM THE SENATE.

A message from the Senate, by Mr. Waldorf, its enrolling clerk, announced that the Senate had disagreed to the amendment of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 703) entitled "An act to provide for the promotion of vocational education; to provide for cooperation with the States in the promotion of such education in agriculture and the trades and industries; to provide for cooperation with the States in the preparation of teachers of vocational subjects; and to appropriate money and regulate its expenditure."

The message also announced that the Senate had passed bills of the following titles, in which the concurrence of the House of Representatives was requested:

S. 4429. An act to amend the postal laws;

S. 7538. An act authorizing the Western New York & Pennsylvania Railway Co. to reconstruct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Allegheny River in Glade and Kinzua Townships, Warren County, Pa.;

S. 7537. An act authorizing the Western New York & Pennsylvania Railway Co. to reconstruct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Allegheny River, in the town of Allegany, county of Cattaraugus, N. Y.; and

S. 7536. An act authorizing the Western New York & Pennsylvania Railway Co. to reconstruct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Allegheny River, in the borough of Warren and township of Pleasant, Warren County, Pa.

The message also announced that the Senate had agreed to the amendments of the House of Representatives to the bill (S. 6864) providing for the continuance of the Osage Indian School, Oklahoma, for a period of 10 years from January 1, 1917.

ORDER OF BUSINESS.

Mr. ADAIR rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Indiana rise?

Mr. ADAIR. This is pension day, Mr. Speaker, and I rise to ask unanimous consent that a bill that the Committee on Invalid Pensions has on the calendar be considered at 5 o'clock this evening.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent that the pension bill indicated by him be considered at 5 o'clock this evening. Is there objection?

Mr. MANN. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Speaker, I suppose that is based on the improbable contingency that the immigration conference report be not disposed of by that time?

Mr. ADAIR. Well, Mr. Speaker, if that should be the condition at that time, I should like to couple with this request the request that this bill then be considered at 5 o'clock Saturday evening, if we fail to reach it to-day.

Mr. MANN. I have no objection to considering it to-day, so far as I am concerned, if the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Moon] does not object.

Mr. ADAIR. It will not take over 15 minutes to dispose of it if the committee is willing to consider it.

The SPEAKER. The situation is this: The Committee on Rules want to bring up that investigation question. That will probably take two hours and a half or three hours. Then, the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. BURNETT] is very anxious to dispose of the conference report on the immigration bill. Why not make it to-morrow evening?

Mr. ADAIR. Well, then, I will ask unanimous consent that to-morrow, at 5 o'clock, we consider this bill, H. R. 19937. No; it is suggested by the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Moon] that I make it 4 o'clock.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman suggests 4 o'clock to-morrow afternoon.

Mr. ADAIR. No; Mr. Speaker, I will withdraw that. I make it 5 o'clock.

Mr. MOON. The appropriation bill ought to be on at that time. This is the day belonging to the Committee on Invalid Pensions, and they ought to have to-day if they desire it. I do not believe the Committee on Rules or anybody else ought to run in on them if they have only a short bill.

Mr. MANN. Why not make it right after the disposition of the conference report on the immigration bill?

Mr. MOON. I think the Post Office Committee should have the right, then.

Mr. MANN. I suggest, then, that the gentleman from Indiana go ahead now.

Mr. MOON. I have no objection to their using to-day for any purpose at all, because we do not expect to get in.

The SPEAKER. What is the gentleman's request?

Mr. MANN. That it should be considered following the immigration conference report.

Mr. ADAIR. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that following the disposal of the immigration bill we consider the pension bill, H. R. 19937.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent to consider the pension bill named by him, following immediately after the conclusion of the conference report on the immigration bill. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

INVESTIGATION UNDER HOUSE RESOLUTION 429.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I present a privileged report (No. 1281) from the Committee on Rules and ask that it be read.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report it.

The Clerk read as follows:

The Committee on Rules, having considered House resolution 429, report the same with the recommendation that it do lie upon the table. The committee states that no evidence was adduced sustaining the charges in the resolution.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, before making a formal motion to lay that on the table, I would like to ask the gentlemen on the other side about the debate on this report. How much time would be satisfactory to the gentleman from Kansas?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Well, the gentleman from Texas will recall that we agreed upon two hours in the committee.

Mr. HENRY. That is entirely satisfactory.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Well, I have had demands for much more time than that. If the gentleman from Texas can get the consent of the other members of the committee and of the House to extend the time, I should like to have 1 hour and 15 minutes.

Mr. HENRY. I would suggest to the gentleman that that would somewhat embarrass me, because arrangements have been made to let us get in early this morning, and another matter is coming up right soon; and, believing that would be satisfactory, it would embarrass me.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Can you make it an hour and 10 minutes on a side?

Mr. HENRY. I think so.

The SPEAKER. What is the request?

Mr. HENRY. I make the request, then, Mr. Speaker, for unanimous consent that the debate on this report be limited to 2 hours and 20 minutes, 1 hour and 10 minutes to be controlled by myself and 1 hour and 10 minutes by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL], with the understanding, then, that at that time I shall move to table the resolution.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that the time of this debate shall be limited to 2 hours and 20 minutes, one half to be controlled by himself and

the other half to be controlled by the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL], and at the end of that time he will move to lay the House resolution on the table. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WINGO rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Arkansas rise?

Mr. WINGO. This is an important matter. We ought to have full membership. I make the point of no quorum.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count.

Pending the count,

Mr. WINGO. Mr. Speaker, I withdraw the point of no quorum.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Arkansas withdraws the point of no quorum. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] is recognized for 1 hour and 10 minutes.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, just a moment by way of explanation, in order that the House may understand the exact issue that we are considering to-day.

This is a report on resolution 429, introduced by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Wood] on January 3 and referred to the Committee on Rules with directions to report within 10 days. Prior to that time, on December 22, the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Wood] had introduced another resolution, No. 420, which is now pending before the Committee on Rules and has not been disposed of or taken up for consideration.

This resolution that we are considering to-day has in it language which switches the original purpose of resolution 420, which was to investigate an alleged leak, and it proposes to investigate the conduct of Members of Congress in regard to transactions on the stock exchange.

The Committee on Rules sat for six days considering this privileged resolution, and during the entire six days not one particle of evidence was adduced to sustain the resolution or any part of it. No Democrat on that committee will contend that there was any evidence. No Republican will assert here to-day that there was any evidence whatever to sustain the charge made in this resolution. The House is now disposing of that proposition. It is not to consider now the allegations made in resolution 420. That resolution, as I said, is now in the hands of the Committee on Rules, and the Committee on Rules has appointed a subcommittee to consider the conduct of a contumacious witness, Thomas W. Lawson, who refused to answer certain questions that were put to him by the Committee on Rules.

Mr. BENNET. Will the gentleman yield for an interruption?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENRY. I would rather not be interrupted.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. HENRY. Those matters may be considered by the committee and by this House in the future, but here is a libel which has been published against the membership of this House, and not a scintilla of evidence has been placed before the Committee on Rules to sustain it. I submit the report to the House and say that every Democrat and every Republican should sustain that report, because we have been unable to find anything that would warrant this libel against the honorable membership of this House.

Mr. Speaker, I reserve the balance of my time.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield seven minutes to the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Wood].

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I have no apology to make to anyone for my position in the matter of this investigation. When I introduced the first resolution on December 22 calling for an investigation, I was impelled to do so because everywhere throughout this Chamber there were ugly rumors being passed from mouth to mouth insinuating that men in high places in governmental affairs had used knowledge which they had obtained in advance of what the President's peace note contained for the purpose of enriching themselves financially through stock-market manipulations. Not only were these rumors rife in this House, but the metropolitan newspapers of the country were carrying in their Associated Press dispatches news items boldly charging that the contents of the President's note had leaked out in advance of its being given to the general public, and that certain parties who had been favored with this knowledge, and solely because of it, had made fortunes on the stock market that mounted well into the millions, and that thousands upon thousands of small investors had lost their savings of a lifetime in consequence.

Was not this of sufficient importance to invite and warrant the attention of this House? If these rumors, so openly uttered, and these newspaper charges, so boldly made, were true, would this House be justified in sitting supinely by and permitting them to go unnoticed? Has the time come when such accusa-

tions of moral turpitude, made against those who are the very guardians of our country's welfare, are inconsequential? If so, then I ask you if the decadence of our governmental fabric has not already commenced?

It has been said, and no doubt it will often be repeated, that I was prompted by purely partisan motives in introducing this resolution, and that I was endeavoring thereby to embarrass the President in his endeavor to bring about peace among the warring nations of the earth. To deny the first of these propositions would be only to invite the sneers of my critics, but the second proposition I can deny and do deny with all the force of my being, for I am now, and have been ever since I became a Member of this House, in favor of any and every proper effort made and to be made by this Government that has for its purpose the bringing to a close this awful conflict in Europe, and I have so expressed myself a number of times, both privately and publicly. It matters but little what may be said about me and my connection with this resolution, but, nevertheless, the fact remains that there is a general belief throughout the country that there is something wrong somewhere, and that that wrong and those who are responsible for it, if anybody is responsible for it, should be ascertained and made public.

That there was a leak of information concerning the President's peace note some time before it was given by the State Department to the public everyone who has followed the course of events knows, and for such a person to deny that there was a leak of this information would be for him to make himself ridiculous. That there was a leak is a fact, which I think is now believed by every Member of this House. As to whether it was caused purposely, and with a sordid design, there may be an honest difference of opinion among Members of this House, and no doubt there is the same difference of opinion prevailing throughout the country; but whether this leak was caused purposely, to aid a select few to reap a fortune, or whether it was entirely innocent, will never be known without the fullest investigation. Without such investigation, you may be assured, the people will form their own conclusions from what they have already read in the public press.

Is not the good name of a public officer worth anything? Is the good opinion of the people concerning our public officials worth seeking? It occurs to me that they are vital to the very existence of our Government.

It has already been charged in the public hearings on these resolutions that a Cabinet officer, a Member of Congress, and another person "higher up" profited financially by reason of this leak. It has also been promised by the man making these charges that if a committee is appointed by this House, with full power and authority to make an investigation, he will give the names of those whom he has thus charged and give that committee the evidence which will establish these charges.

We can not absolve ourselves from our responsibility in the premises by saying that we have no faith in this man or in the charges he has made, and that because of our disbelief we will refuse to appoint this committee. I warn you now that if we take such a course it will have this effect: It will confirm into belief a feeling now existing in the mind of the public that we do not dare to make this investigation for fear it will involve not only some who are connected with the administrative branch of the Government, but that it will involve Members of this Congress as well. Can we as Members of this House, can the Nation, afford to have such an opinion existing among the people of our country?

There is another reason why this investigation should be had. As I have heretofore stated, a citizen of this country has charged that a member of the Cabinet, a Member of this Congress, and possibly another man "higher up" profited on the stock market by reason of advance information received concerning the President's peace note. Now, there are 10 members of the President's Cabinet; there are 435 Members of this House and 96 Members of the Senate. The individual member of the Cabinet or the individual Member of this Congress, against whom these charges have been lodged, has not been specifically named. If this investigation is not had, the public will be free to say whomsoever it pleases is the guilty man in the Cabinet and in the Congress.

It is, therefore, due to each member of the Cabinet and to each Member of the Congress that this step should be taken in order that his reputation may not be for a single moment tainted even with suspicion. It is due to the President of the United States that this investigation should be made, and above all it is due to this Government.

The country from ocean to ocean is interested in the outcome of this proceeding. The eyes of the people are on this Congress this day, watching to see whether or not we will institute

the machinery whereby the fullest possible investigation shall be given to this affair or whether we will whitewash it.

The editorials in the newspapers of this country are said to be a fair index of the sentiment of the people living in the communities where these papers are published. If this be true, there can be no mistake in what the sentiment of the people is with reference to the necessity for the fullest possible investigation of this whole affair.

In order that you may know what the sentiment of the country is, as reflected by these editorial indexes, I will make a few of them a part of my remarks.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. WOOD of Indiana. The following is from the Detroit (Mich.) Free Press:

THE SCANDAL IN WASHINGTON.

Washington is sitting in the shadow of a governmental scandal affecting the honor of the whole national administration. There is accusation of a leakage previous to authorized announcement that Mr. Wilson had dispatched a note to the European powers, and a charge that this leakage enabled certain favored persons to make big fortunes in Wall Street by reason of their foreknowledge of an event certain to depress the stock market. Thus far the report directly affects two Senators and two Cabinet members, one of whom is said to have profited largely in a financial way.

There is no doubt about the existence of the leak; there is no doubt about the manipulation in Wall Street; there is little doubt that the first tip was passed out by persons closely in touch with the White House; and there seems to have been gross breach of confidence somewhere by men Mr. Wilson trusted.

The State Department has suggested that newspaper men might be responsible; it has asserted that a number of them received in advance information about the President's note before it was published. Now it is averred that the first intimation in Wall Street of what was going to happen in Washington was passed along as early as Monday, before the President had completed the draft of his writing. Unquestionably high Government officials knew of the President's intention at this time. But on Monday when Mr. Wilson received the Washington correspondents in general audience for the first time since the Bryan régime, he gave a little talk on the subject of peace and told his auditors that while peace was most devoutly to be desired it was not the purpose to urge upon the belligerents irritating importunities to lay down their arms. Clearly Mr. Wilson gave the newspaper men no information on Monday.

The President's communication was given to the cables on Tuesday. Did the leak spring in the cable offices? Insiders on Wall Street seem to have known about the note long before the cable companies received it.

While every possible angle of the situation should be taken into consideration, at present only one hypothesis seems to lead anywhere. It is the hypothesis which connects guilt for the breach of confidence with those in public office who have profited financially.

The whole affair suggests the presence of a horrifying lack of moral sense somewhere in official Washington; it indicates a total inability to understand the responsibilities of high national stewardship, sheer ethical depravity among some of those with responsible parts in directing the destinies of the Nation.

A resolution calling for an investigation has already been introduced in the lower House of Congress. Nothing less than this could be done. Emphatically there ought to be an investigation, a searching of the whole administration to find out where the guilt lies for the disgrace brought on the American Government and to clear up the taint on its honor. But the investigation should be real, not one of those whitewash affairs which have been the common, if not the invariable rule in Washington these last four years. The probe should be instituted for the purpose of cleaning up, not for the purpose of amelioration or to cloak scandal.

We confess to small hope that there will be any real inquiry. Something may be done, but we fear it will be like all the other probes in late years, a futile, anemic thing, that will eventually die from inanition.

And this from the Fort Wayne (Ind.) News:

A WHITE HOUSE LEAK.

President Wilson evidently has a leak pretty close to the desk on which he composes his nice little notes. This has been broadly intimated several times in the past, but the evidence to this effect provided on Wednesday apparently justifies such a declaration in all particulars. Consider the facts for a moment.

Wednesday afternoon the New York stock market, which had been reviving ever since the break caused by the German peace proposals, suddenly went all to pieces. Stocks tumbled and the bears raided the market in a fearsome fashion. In the stock report published in the News, and which comes over a stock broker's private wire, was carried this interesting bit of information concerning the slump:

"The Dow Jones financial ticker, in offering an explanation of the break, said the Street had received confidential reports that the administration will address to the belligerents 'some suggestions or proposals in regard to peace' in the near future."

What the public would like to know is how and from what source the Street received this confidential information. None of the press associations carried it, and their reports as published in the afternoon papers indicated an opposite condition of affairs, expressly stating that the United States would keep hands off. The Washington correspondents were in ignorance of what was transpiring in the President's private office, yet, strangely enough, a certain coterie of gamblers on the New York Stock Exchange knew all about it and proceeded to clean up handsomely. The real news of Wednesday afternoon concerning the peace situation was not incorporated in the

dispatches of the press associations, but was circulated over the country via the wires of the stock brokers.

Who was the man who gave this advance information to stock gamblers of New York? That he was close to President Wilson we know from the fact that the news was guarded so sedulously that even the keenest of the Washington correspondents had no hint of it, and that he must have profited largely by the tip we can readily surmise. It would seem that President Wilson owes it to himself to investigate the matter of this leak and eliminate the possibility of some future incident that might cruelly embarrass him. There is a sinister suggestion even in the story of Wednesday.

And listen to this from the New York Evening Globe:

THE WALL STREET SCANDAL.

For some days Wall Street has been filled with rumors about persons with supposedly close Washington connections making huge "killings" in the stock market by reason of advance information concerning developments in the international situation. The outcome is the resolution introduced yesterday in the House by Representative Wood of Indiana, calling for an investigation by a committee of five members to ascertain specifically whether anyone high in the administration, or any relative of any such official, profited financially, directly or indirectly, by the fluctuations in the stock market on Thursday growing out of Secretary Lansing's contradictory interpretations of the President's peace note.

It seems incredible that any high official in Washington should be so implicated. When Wall Street loses its head it is liable to talk foolishly. But the present scandal has assumed such proportions as to compel attention. The truth should be got at, and a committee such as proposed should be clothed with ample power to sift the matter to the bottom. If there is a ring of stock gamblers with underground wires into the inner offices of official Washington, the public is entitled to know it. If the rumors are baseless, no one should be more concerned than the administration in having that fact made known.

And this from the Syracuse (N. Y.) Herald:

WAS THERE A LEAK IN WASHINGTON?

The resolution introduced in the House of Representatives by Mr. Wood of Indiana, calling for an investigation of the charge that advance knowledge of the President's late peace message to the European powers was used for speculative purposes in Wall Street, will in all probability be favorably acted upon. It is clearly a case for careful inquiry. The rumor that a member of the Cabinet was among those who profited by the secret may be absolutely unfounded, and, at any rate, the country will be slow to credit it. But the very gravity of the suspicion this aroused emphasizes the necessity for a congressional investigation.

All that is known in this connection is that some powerful stock speculators were able to anticipate the falling market in a way that suggested that they were the beneficiaries of an official "leak" in Washington. It is possible, of course, that if such was the case the leak was an accidental one or the result of a breach of confidence that was devoid of mercenary intent. But the country ought to know the truth. Mysterious advance tips in Wall Street on impending developments likely to affect the stock market are no novelty. But if these take the form of a betrayal of Government secrets, the public has the right to know the why and wherefore.

And this from the New York Times:

MORE CARE NEEDED.

The administration should not treat as a mere matter of passing interest the current belief in Wall Street that some of the individuals doing business there had advance information of the fact that the President intended to send a note to foreign powers. The administration's intentions, when they are guarded as this one was from the general public, should be guarded from untrustworthy individuals. There should be special precautions against such a leak. Carelessness in a matter involving fortune or disaster to many private fortunes is not to be excused.

The foundation for the big "drive" on stocks on Thursday was laid on Wednesday, and the belief exists in Wall Street that the persons who made the preliminary attacks then and on Thursday morning had availed themselves of information which should have been withheld from them, and would have been if the ordinary amount of care had been exercised.

On the heels of this banging at the stocks, and while gossip was already busy with the story of a leak, Secretary Lansing indulged in his unfortunate habit of soliloquizing in public and completed the demoralization of the stock market. He could not have chosen a more unlucky time for the display of his idiosyncrasy. Nothing except the painful teaching of experience is a cure for this, and he probably regrets what occurred as much as anybody; but for the other matter, the loose guarding of official information, there is a different remedy, which the administration should seek and apply.

And this from the Washington Times:

IT'LL BE INVESTIGATED!

The House has directed Chairman HENRY and his Committee on Rules to report in 10 days on a resolution for investigation of the "leak" charges. It is a bit uncertain whether Mr. Lawson's accusations, or the seeming anxiety of some influences to avoid the investigation, have done most to fix in the public mind the conviction that there must be some fire back of all the smoke.

One thing is very certain, however. The private conferences between Chairman HENRY and the Boston financier, resulting in Mr. HENRY's decision that there was no need to call his committee together, have not made a pleasant impression. The other members of the Rules Committee could have spared the time, without any great sacrifice of public interest, to attend these conferences. If they had done so, the whole proceeding would have looked nicer. The refusal of the chairman to take the rest of his committee into his confidence has resulted in a condition that brings the whole affair before the House and takes up many hours of the precious time of that body.

Back in the olden days, before it was supposed that the House had been reformed away from the czarship of committee chairmen, it was common enough for the head of a great committee to regard himself as the custodian of his committee's business. He was a sort of ambassador of the House organization to consider its relations with the outside world. That relationship is supposed to have ended; and the action of the House in ordering the Henry committee to perform is a

hint that the House does not intend to permit a return to the old system of star-chamber considerations.

As various Members have declared, the things that happened in the stock-dealing world made it very clear that there was a "leak" somewhere. Mr. BENNET, of New York, caused a sensation, we are assured, when he named a name in connection with these charges; yet he merely mentioned a name in a public place that has been in many minds and had been associated with various stories concerning the market movements. It is rather more sensational that the mention of any name, the statement of any specific ground for charges, should have been suppressed so long.

Denunciation of Mr. Lawson and the application of epithets to him does not brush aside the facts which are apparent enough. Somebody knew enough to justify tremendous plunging in the market and permit huge profits to be won. The mere fact that there has been such insistent objection to investigation has left a bad taste.

And the following from the Boston (Mass.) Traveler:

INVESTIGATE.

Thomas W. Lawson in his characteristic manner has dared Congressman Wood and Congress itself to investigate the leak between the White House and Wall Street. He has done so in a manner that makes it impossible for Congress to neglect the challenge.

It is not necessary to accept Mr. Lawson's screaming statements at their face value. Few people do. But it is necessary to discover just what particular gang of gamblers was able to obtain advance information at the White House and turn it to their own advantage. Such an investigation might prevent some other gang of gamblers from operating successfully by the same method on some future occasion.

It is not a partisan question. It is a question of patriotism. It affects, indirectly, the President himself. The President can procure or prevent an investigation. If he prevents one it will be, presumably, because prevention means protection to somebody who, in the President's opinion, must be protected at any cost.

And this from the Indianapolis (Ind.) News:

THE STATE DEPARTMENT LEAK.

After a conference yesterday with Thomas W. Lawson, Representative HENRY, chairman of the House Rules Committee, said that Mr. Lawson had given no facts in regard to the supposed "rigging" of the stock market by those who had advance information of the President's recent note. Lawson, according to Mr. HENRY, could not give the names of those thought to be responsible for "the so-called leak between the State Department and Wall Street," nor could he give "the names of those charged by him with cleaning up \$60,000,000 in connection with the leak."

What Lawson apparently wanted was "an investigation of the entire stock exchange situation." The American people will, we think, be more interested in the admission by Senator STONE, made in a speech delivered yesterday, that "confidential communications with foreign Governments to the State Department have by some means found their way into the hands of men not authorized to receive them." These betrayals of confidence did not, the Missouri Senator said, concern stock-market speculation, but they "did concern the honor of the Nation."

Here is a reason that almost seems to compel an investigation. If, as Senator STONE said "confidential communications concerning the honor of the Nation" have "fallen into improper hands," and if this misconduct is to be traced to departmental employees, surely something should be done to set matters right. It is not necessary to act on Lawson's tip, since we have STONE's statement that "things have taken place in the departments which ought not to be possible," and that the honor of the Nation is involved. Eliminating Lawson's stories altogether, there is the strongest sort of evidence tending to prove the guilt of some one—the evidence offered by Senator STONE in his speech in the Senate.

As to Lawson, it is to be said that, though he is undoubtedly a sensationalist and an egotist, he does sometimes get things right. So there may be some substance to his charges. If information got out—and this is admitted by Senator STONE—it would be strange if some men in Wall Street did not get hold of it.

This from the New York World:

A CALL FOR MR. LAWSON.

Thomas W. Lawson's theory that a majority of both Houses of Congress profited by the alleged leak to Wall Street respecting the President's peace note to Germany and Secretary Lansing's explanation of it is no doubt an exaggeration. Leaks that are public property are not leaks at all.

Nevertheless, the Boston operator, in his usual picturesque language, throws down a challenge which Congress can not ignore. Besides making the positive assertion that he knows a great deal about the affair, he expresses a willingness to testify. His insinuation that nobody at the Capital cares to pursue the matter should make a searching public inquiry the more certain.

In probing such accusations as have been made in New York and Washington in this case, it is always best to stick to probabilities. If there was a leak, and, as Mr. Lawson says, those who profited by it made \$60,000,000 in two days, it is certain that not many people had the information.

It will do no good to indulge in indiscriminate aspersions upon the character of public men. The World is old-fashioned enough to believe that the preponderance of honesty among them is very great. Holding firmly to that opinion, it is confident that this scandal must be met boldly and intelligently, and since Mr. Lawson is the most vehement among its circulators, that he should be heard first, openly and fully.

This from the Syracuse (N. Y.) Post:

WHO LEAKED?

A Republican Representative wants Congress to inquire how it happened that Wall Street speculators, who have been upon intimate relations with members of the administration, had advance information about the President's peace message; and whether the prompt use made of that information was of profit only to themselves.

The inquiry involves a serious reflection upon some one in the President's official household. If there were no basis for the suspicion, the resolution of Representative Wood would be studied insult. But the startling fact is that Wall Street operators who have been active in Democratic politics did know that the message was coming. The fact is that they could not have known excepting through one of a few men prominent in public life. The reasonable conclusion is that he who told did not do so without expectation of a share in the plunder.

The Democrats in Congress can not afford to pigeonhole the resolution of inquiry. The administration can not afford to rest under the suspicion that some one who is sufficiently important to be consulted upon its international policy is using his information to play the market. Upon the face of the situation there has been a scandalous union of official information and private profit, and the administration should, in jealous regard for its own reputation, demand a searching inquiry.

And this from the New York City Telegraph:

CONGRESS MUST NOW INVESTIGATE THE LAWSON CHARGES OF A LEAK.

It is proper to thank Thomas W. Lawson, of Boston, for one thing. Whether his charges have foundation in fact or not, he has created a situation from which neither he nor the Congress of the United States can escape without a full, complete, and restrained investigation of the recent Wall Street slump following President Wilson's peace letter. Mr. Lawson asserts that insiders, those who knew in advance that such a letter was to be sent, took \$60,000,000 away from a gullible public which has no wires reaching into official departments. Representative Wood of Indiana has introduced a resolution calling for an investigation, and Mr. Lawson will be a witness before a committee of Congress appointed to take testimony.

Mr. Lawson seems confident that he can make good. He has sent a telegram to Mr. Wood and to Mr. HENRY, in which he denies that he has tried to evade service, and in which he further asserts that other "leaks" are impending.

The Morning Telegraph in the interest of good sportsmanship insists that the game should be played fair—that all the cards should be spread out on the table, that there should be no hocus-pocus or cold-decking in the interest of an official coterie and their friends. If any group at Washington or elsewhere took a profit of \$60,000,000, some other group lost that sum, not because of bad judgment but because it was up against a "sure thing."

By all means let there be an investigation, and, in the language of Gen. U. S. Grant, "Let no guilty man escape."

And the following from the Providence (R. I.) News:

LET THE PUBLIC HAVE THE FACTS.

Congressman HENRY has no Wall Street affiliations, so his demand of the inimitable Thomas W. Lawson to make good his claim that Washington parties profited to the extent of millions by reason of a "leak" in regard to the President's peace note must be met. Congressman Wood, a Republican, did a very proper thing in introducing a resolution to investigate certain rumors concerning this matter. His resolution is before the Committee on Rules of the House of Representatives, and Congressman HENRY is at the head of that committee which is to decide whether there should be an investigation or not. There are not a few people who believe that the real trouble is not over any leak, but because President Wilson did not first tell some men what he was going to do before he sent his note to the belligerents. Whatever the truth may be it is to be hoped that Mr. Wood's resolution will be indorsed by the committee on rules and that Mr. Lawson will go to Washington and tell all he knows. Because Mr. Lawson may be deemed by some folks considerable of a blusterer should not prevent his giving the public any facts that he may have. He does not dislike Wall Street a bit more than does Congressman HENRY, so there should be a showdown.

And this from the Albany (N. Y.) Argus:

Thomas W. Lawson was always apt to talk big with his mouth whenever desirable to impress innocents with his power and skill in the stock market. Whether his boasts that he had tips from Washington for advance "rigging" of the market for the smash following the President's peace note remains for the evidence to show, under the resolution of Representative Wood of Indiana, for an investigation of the matter. Though Wood is a Republican, any Democrat will put himself under reasonable suspicion who opposes the investigation. The indications are that there was a "rigging," that Lawson was on hand to partake of the slaughter, and that there must have been a "leak" somewhere. Wood tells, among many other cases of the kind, how stock brokers in his home town of La Fayette had advices from New York of the forthcoming note several hours before it appeared. The men in Washington that could possibly have had the information must be a small number, and it ought not to be difficult for a searching investigation to locate the guilt; for without any undue sympathy for the victims who were sure to be shorn before long anyway, if speculative traffic in Government information can go unpunished in one case it will be an incitement to multiplication of it, even down into legislation, as in the Sugar Trust scandal 22 years ago.

These are but a few of the hundreds of editorials that have been written upon this subject, but they certainly are sufficient and should be convincing of the absolute necessity for a thorough investigation. Nothing less will satisfy the public. Nothing less should satisfy each individual Member of this House.

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Speaker, since the hour of meeting has been changed from 12 to 11 o'clock, a great many Members are not apprised of that fact, and in order that we may have a full attendance on this occasion I make the point of no quorum.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will count. [After counting.] Two hundred and thirty Members present, a quorum.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON].

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. Mr. Speaker, this is the most extraordinary exhibition of little politics that the Republican minority has attempted since I became a Member of this House. I had hoped that after the verdict of the American people had been rendered in November the kind of campaign that was conducted by the Republican Party not only of misrepresenting official acts of the administration but at times attacking personal character, would at least sleep for a time; but we find that it is begun again at this early day.

The first Wood resolution, No. 420, was conceived, has been nurtured, and is now attempted to be sustained in a spirit of rank partisanship. Every allegation contained in it, either by

insinuation, innuendo, or otherwise, has been clearly and conclusively shown to be without foundation. There is no man upon the minority of the Rules Committee or on that side of the aisle who will rise now in his place on this floor and say he is in favor of reporting it favorably, because those who are familiar with the hearing know the allegations therein contained are inexcusably and unjustifiably made. What is the situation?

Mr. BENNET. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. No; not for the present.

Mr. BENNET. I rise for the purpose that the gentleman said I would not rise for.

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. I ask the gentleman now if anything transpired in the committee which should induce us to report favorably resolution 420, the resolution that was made privileged and referred?

Mr. BENNET. Does the gentleman ask me?

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. Yes; I ask you.

Mr. BENNET. Yes; I do. The evidence yesterday morning was that before Mr. Lansing had his conference with the newspaper men at all the information was in Wall Street that the President was going to send out a peace note; and I also call the gentleman's attention to the fact that when that statement came out the majority moved to conclude the hearing without trying to find out where that came from. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HARRISON of Mississippi. The gentleman has not answered my question at all. I said there was not a Member of the minority who would vote to report out the original resolution, 420, and there is not. You dare not say you will. There was in the committee a substitute motion, changing the language of the original motion in many respects, and we were asked to vote for that. You demonstrated by your action that you had abandoned the original resolution. You did not even suggest favorable action on it. You have abandoned the resolution that was referred to the committee because of its privileged character—the one now before the House. You do not dare to say, after hearing the testimony, that it should be passed; but in its stead you offer a different resolution.

Now, what is the situation? There came many witnesses before the committee. We sat there for a week, trying in every way to obtain the presence of witnesses from all over the country, trying to ascertain if there was a leak, and who, if anyone, was responsible for it and profited by it. There was the greatest liberality allowed in the procuring and questioning of witnesses. Questions that were most irrelevant and only of a political character were permitted to be asked witnesses without objection. Whenever a rumor came to us, we employed the strong arm of the Sergeant at Arms of this House to bring the witnesses before the committee, that the facts might be ascertained and the truth known. Our only desire has been to conduct the investigations in such a way that truth might triumph and justice prevail. Mr. Wood, the author of the resolutions, came before us and stated that he had a letter in his possession that would show that Mr. Tumulty and Mr. Baruch held a conference in the Biltmore Hotel in New York City shortly before this note was published, and that Mr. Baruch played the market on knowledge obtained presumably from that conference and profited to a great extent. He practically charged the same thing against Mr. Bolling, the President's brother-in-law. He said he believed evidence could be produced of similar import against Mr. Kuhn, of Kuhn, Loeb & Co. But when we brought these men before the committee and they were sworn, we found that Mr. Tumulty had not been in New York, that he had had no conference with Mr. Baruch, that he knew nothing about the note that was being sent by the President until the newspapers had it. In other words, Mr. Speaker, the whole thing could be spelled with three little letters. We had Mr. Baruch before us. He said he had no such conference, and instead of selling stocks, as was charged by the gentleman from New York [Mr. BENNET] on the floor of the House, in support of that privileged resolution, on the 20th of December, and insinuated by Mr. Wood, he was buying stock on that date, and that he had no information concerning this leak whatever.

Mr. Bolling stated under oath that he knew nothing about the leak, had no information of the note, and did not play the stock market at all. Every witness that was brought into the matter by the author of the resolution conclusively refuted the charges and showed them to be without foundation in fact. And upon what did the author of the resolution base it? Mr. Wood swore before this committee that he based these charges on a letter signed by "A. Curtis," the letter being shown to be without a professional mark or letterhead, without any postmark on it, without any address, and without ascertaining anything about A. Curtis, and mark you, gentlemen, this letter came to him

four or five days after he introduced the resolution charging a leak. No one knows who Curtis is, and yet on such information men high in official life are thus assailed and held to suspicion in the eyes of the world. Are you to believe any further statements by men upon such measly testimony as he produced?

Not satisfied with that, he introduced another resolution of a privileged character on words uttered by this irresponsible, frenzied four-flusher, Lawson, and makes it privileged, charging this Capitol with wallowing for 40 years in graft and corruption; charging men who have occupied places during the last 40 years in this House, and in the Senate, and in the White House, and on the Supreme Court bench with corruption, and you are aiding and abetting it when you do not follow the suggestion offered by the majority of the Rules Committee.

Now, what about Lawson? Here he sits in Boston and says, "I defy you to hold an investigation; I will prove that the Capitol has wallowed in corruption and graft for 40 years." He tried to work that bluff, and we said, "All right; we will hold an investigation." We did. We said, "Come to us and we will make you put up or shut up." Ah, the Republican members of the Rules Committee tried in every imaginable way to extract answers from him, but time after time he said in substance, "I have no first-hand knowledge about this matter. I know there was a leak, but what I want is an investigation of the stock exchanges of the country." For two days we pressed him with questions without avail. You men are being duped by him, while he sits in his hotel in this city and pays for advertisements in the papers trying to bluff Congress. I doubt if there is a member of the Rules Committee, either on the majority or minority side, after seeing him perform and hearing his testimony, who would believe him under oath, but you think you can play little, mean, nasty politics in this matter, and reap some partisan advantage from it. There is no one who believes this resolution referred to the Rules Committee ought to be favorably reported. Republicans would not vote for it, and I say to gentlemen on this side of the aisle, as one member who sat and listened to it, who was open to conviction, who desired to get facts, and who wanted the truth to be known, that there was not a scintilla of evidence before that committee to show that anybody connected with the Government had knowledge of a leak or played the stock market and profited by it. I do not believe there was a leak, but there were a thousand ways it could have gotten out through the newspapers and other sources.

Mr. Tumulty, the Secretary to the President, a man whose reputation needs no defense at my hands, who never before has been assailed in such an unwarranted manner, has proved his innocence in this matter. And Mr. Wood, the author of the resolution, stated before the committee that if these charges, being so infamous, are not proven, we ought to clear the names of the men mentioned in the "A. Curtis" letter. I submit to Mr. Wood now, in view of the testimony reported in the hearings, that apologies are due to Mr. Baruch, to Mr. Tumulty, to Mr. Lansing, to Mr. Kahn, and to Mr. Bolling, who were brought into the matter through this virtually anonymous letter. [Applause.]

Gentlemen on this side of the House are you going to allow them to play politics in this matter? We have tried to get evidence. For six days we have tried to extract it from the witnesses. Mr. CAMPBELL, a Republican member of the committee, asked questions, stated to Mr. Lawson that the committee had the authority to investigate the matter, and tried to get the questions answered at that hearing. The gentleman from New York [Mr. BENNET] and the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] and the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHIPPEFIELD], of the minority, made motions to bring Mr. Lawson up in the House for contempt because he would not answer the questions. Why did you do it, if you did not think we had jurisdiction then to deal with this witness? [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Mississippi has expired.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 12 minutes to the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT].

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] has sought to make his side of the House believe that the action of the minority members of the Committee on Rules and that the action that the minority will take upon this resolution to-day is purely for political purposes. Mr. Speaker, I want to read just a paragraph from an editorial in yesterday's New York World, the leading paper of this Democratic administration to-day. What do they say about this matter? They say:

When the committee had finished with the responsible witnesses it had nothing to report to the House except that it had made itself ridiculous and permitted Thomas W. Lawson to turn a grave public proceeding into a cheap and degrading farce. If the committee had

conspired with the Boston speculator to excite public contempt for Congress it could not have achieved a greater measure of success. Unless Congress exerts its authority and dignity in the matter of this witness, it will deserve all the public derision that has been heaped upon it.

That is not the view of a Republican; that is the view of the leading Democratic newspaper of the United States. I say to you on that side that when you vote with the majority members of the Committee on Rules to-day on this resolution your vote says to Thomas W. Lawson, "Go home to Boston, you are not in contempt of the House." That is exactly the situation, and nothing more, because when that committee yesterday morning adopted a motion to report this resolution to the House, the only resolution that Lawson was called before the committee on and upon which he testified, when they made and carried that motion they said, and the chairman of the committee has repeated it this morning, that these questions that we attempted to get Lawson to answer in which he defied the committee were immaterial questions and had nothing to do with the case. It could not be anything else, because if they were material it was the duty of the committee to retain jurisdiction of this resolution, to proceed in the matter and either get answers to them or have Lawson committed for contempt. [Applause.]

Now, the gentleman from Mississippi has discussed many things which did not appear in the hearing. He has not discussed the things which did appear. I want to call attention to the matter in issue, so far as Mr. Lawson is concerned. He stated that a Member of Congress had told him certain things, and using his language:

I heard a Cabinet officer's name mentioned by a Member of Congress in connection with this leak, and mentioned in an earnest, serious manner, to show me that the whole subject was a serious affair, was a serious subject and must be treated seriously, and I agreed with him.

Further on he said:

He was mentioned in such a way that was fully as close to the leak as if he had speculated himself. He was mentioned in connection with the whole leak, and the speculation in the leak—not idly mentioned, but mentioned in a very serious way, and because it was so serious and I considered it so serious, I refused to go further with it unless it was necessary.

Mr. Lawson also testified:

I corroborated that. I had more than that. I had a reputable banker, a friend of the other banker, and a friend of mine, and I said, "What do you know about it?" And he said, "I know the banker stated to me that he not only had this account and others, but had such absolute control of a Cabinet member that he could bring him from Washington to New York or on the telephone at any hour of the day or night," and offered then and there to call him up at half past 1 in the morning to answer these questions.

Now, the committee had repeatedly sought to get Mr. Lawson to give the name of this Congressman. He refused. Members tried to get him to give these other names. He refused, and he defied the committee. Will any member of that committee say that this testimony was not material testimony? Suppose these charges are true—should they be investigated and proceeded further with or not? Mr. Speaker, up to yesterday morning, I want to very frankly say, it was my judgment that there was nothing in Mr. Lawson's statement with reference to a Member of Congress; that if that Member had been named and was called upon on the stand, he would have cleared up this matter by a denial; but, Mr. Speaker, I have reluctantly been compelled to come to the conclusion from the action of this committee in taking the course that it did, which will absolve Mr. Lawson at any time in the future without a new investigation by this House, from giving the name of this Member of Congress—I am compelled to conclude that there was a Member of Congress who stated these things to Mr. Lawson, and I am further compelled to conclude that the name of that Member of Congress belongs upon the Democratic side of this House. I do not claim for a moment that if that Democratic Congressman is called that evidence will be produced that will prove that a member of the Cabinet or anyone else was guilty of wrongdoing; but I have a right to conclude from the action of the majority that some Member of Congress did say something to Mr. Lawson, and that that Member of Congress does not care to go upon the stand.

Mr. BOOHER rose.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. LENROOT. For what purpose?

Mr. BOOHER. To ask a question.

Mr. LENROOT. I yield for a question.

Mr. BOOHER. Will the gentleman name to this House now the Member of Congress upon this side that he has in mind who gave that information?

Mr. LENROOT. I have no Member of Congress in mind.

Mr. BOOHER. Then the gentleman is in exactly the same position as Mr. Lawson.

Mr. LENROOT. Let us see. I will say to the gentleman that I gave to this committee the name of a gentleman and

his address to whom Mr. Lawson related this conversation and in which he gave the name of this Member of Congress, and the committee had the opportunity—

Mr. BOOHER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. LENROOT. I do not yield—and the committee had the opportunity to call that man before it and get the name of that Member of Congress and did not do so.

Mr. RAKER rose.

Mr. LENROOT. I can not yield. Mr. Speaker, I apprehend before this debate is over that some one on the Democratic side will state, and he is at perfect liberty to state, that some of the Republican Members, myself included, doubted the jurisdiction of this committee to compel these answers, but I want to say in anticipation of that statement that we repeatedly suggested to the Committee on Rules that in five minutes they could come before this House and be clothed with the fullest authority to ask these questions or any other questions they might think pertinent to the inquiry. They could at any time have brought this matter before the House, and obtained authority from the House to require Mr. Lawson to answer these questions. What is the situation? When the committee reported this resolution, the jurisdiction of the Committee on Rules was lost. When they reported this resolution as they have, by that action they reported adversely upon every motion that was made before the committee to cite Mr. Lawson before the bar of this House for contempt. When they reported this resolution the Committee on Rules lost all jurisdiction over the subject, and Mr. Lawson at this moment is free to leave the city of Washington because of the action of the Committee on Rules.

Mr. Speaker, the Chairman stated that a subcommittee had been created to further consider this matter of contempt. The record will show that that is not true. No subcommittee was created by this Committee on Rules to consider that question. A subcommittee was created for the purpose of preparing papers in case the committee should decide to cite Mr. Lawson before the House for contempt, but when the committee acted upon this resolution, that fell to the ground as did everything else in connection with this investigation.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Wisconsin has expired.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield the gentleman two more minutes.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, I want to say in closing that the gentleman from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] charged this was a matter of politics. I challenge any Member of this House to read the questions asked of the various witnesses by the Republican members of the Committee on Rules, and I say that any one reading that testimony, if he did not know the political affiliations of the Republican members, would not know from the reading whether they were asked by Republicans or Democrats. In the consideration of this question there has been injected into it nothing of a political issue by the minority members of the Committee on Rules.

But in so far as a political issue has been made of it it has been due solely to the amazing action of the majority members of the Committee on Rules in their attempt here and now to stifle this matter to prevent the name of this Member of Congress being revealed and give him an opportunity to testify upon the stand. [Applause.]

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT]. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, this is a matter which has many angles and which is viewed from many different standpoints. I think it is well that in periods of stress and excitement there are those who can retain their equilibrium and apply to such propositions as these ordinary common sense. I think this House should understand clearly and definitely the particular, specific thing which is now before it and upon which it will shortly be called to vote. House resolution 429 was presented by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOL] on the floor of the House with the claim that it was a privileged resolution. It was held to be privileged by the Speaker of the House and upon motion of the gentleman from Indiana it was referred to the Committee on Rules with instructions to report within 10 days. By a subsequent resolution adopted the same day the Committee on Rules was authorized in the investigation to be made by it in the consideration of resolution 429 to send for persons and papers and to administer oaths.

The committee has concluded the preliminary investigation upon that resolution, and in accordance with the instructions of the House has made report. We recommend that the resolution be laid upon the table. The reason for this recommenda-

tion is that there has not been found a single scintilla of evidence; there has not been made a single suggestion; there has not been offered a single intimation that any Member of the House of Representatives was in any way connected with stock speculation. There is not the faintest shadow of suspicion thrown upon the House of Representatives or upon any Member thereof as to having committed any act legally or ethically culpable, and therefore there exists no possible reason for further investigation of or under House resolution 429. [Applause on the Democratic side.] We think the time has come when the curtain should be rung down and there should be an end of at least scene 1 of what has been a roaring farce, except that unfortunately it has been shot through with touches of tragedy. If there exists in the mind of any of you gentlemen an idea that you are under suspicion, permit me to assure you now that nothing has developed in the testimony to indicate a ground for your suspicion. [Laughter.] House resolution 429 was held privileged because it referred and related by intimation to Members of the House of Representatives. It was upon that ground alone that it was held to be privileged. If any of you gentlemen desire to hold yourselves under further suspicion by voting against tabling this resolution, why, of course, we have no power to prevent your doing so. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Having said that much, I should like to go a step further. I anticipated that perhaps some such denouement as this would occur when the resolution was presented. I did not like to question the good faith of gentlemen who were sponsors for it and charge that they were endeavoring to use a parliamentary subterfuge, but I did make the point of order and insist that it was not privileged. In that I was overruled, and I do not complain, because I was forcefully struck by the statement of the gentleman from Indiana in answer to a question which I put to him that he believed that he had facts in his possession that would justify an investigation. I repeat I was forcefully impressed by that, and I did not thereafter urge with great vehemence that it be held nonprivileged; but when the gentleman from Indiana came before the Committee on Rules and gave his sworn testimony he left the members of that committee in bewilderment and astonishment as to what possible basis he could have had for the statement made in answer to inquiry on the floor of the House that he believed that he had facts to justify an investigation.

The gentleman from Indiana upon his oath assured the committee that there was no political influence which controlled him in presenting the resolution, and so we were left to guess what the motive could be. I do not know what the other Members have thought, because we have not interchanged views about it, but somehow, in some way, I have been driven to the conclusion that the gentleman from Indiana's motive was his desire to enter into rivalry with another gentleman from Indiana whose occupation is the writing of comedies for the stage and fables for the newspapers. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Of course, the principal actor in this matter which has been staged was Mr. Thomas W. Lawson. Much has been said of Mr. Lawson. Opinions differ as to what should be done with Mr. Lawson. I suppose most people think he ought to be confined, but there is a difference of opinion as to where he should be confined. [Applause.] Some think in a jail, others think in an asylum, but there is this much to be said for Mr. Lawson: Again and again Mr. Lawson said before that committee, "I have no evidence that would be received in a court of justice and I decline to involve the names of men upon rumor." There are those who might profit by the example of even Mr. Lawson. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Mr. Lawson said this. He said that if there was a leak it was of no detriment to the public; that, in fact, it was of benefit to the public if there was such a thing, and he said that his whole motive, all the interviews that he had given out and all the advertising he had been doing, was not in an effort to get an investigation regarding a leak and an attempt to reflect upon any official of the Government, but it was—

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HENRY. I yield the gentleman two minutes more.

Mr. GARRETT (continuing). But he was using that—I do not quote his exact language, but the meaning—as a subterfuge in endeavoring to obtain an investigation of the stock exchange for legislative purposes. Well, if the stock exchange should be investigated for legislative purposes, and I am not denying that it should be, I have no objection to that; that ought to be done by a legislative committee of the House for legislative purposes and not mingled with idle stories and foolish rumors of scandal for which there is no basis in fact. [Applause.]

Gentlemen, these things come and go in every Congress. Again and again during my experience here we have witnessed

these sensational things come, and they are forgotten. We had a few years ago what is commonly known as the Mulhall investigation. Do you suppose there is one citizen in a hundred thousand in the United States to-day who even remembers that there was such an investigation? We are trifling with small things, with things for which there is no basis. This House can much better maintain its dignity by preserving its calmness and using its common sense. [Applause.]

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. CHIPERFIELD]. [Applause.]

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Mr. Speaker, I quite agree with the statement of the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT], for whom I have a very affectionate regard, that it is time that the curtain should ring down on the first act of the play, which proves to be a farce, and it is high time that it should rise on the second act, with the people of this country viewing the stage in the full light of day when the drama is produced, "The honor of Congress."

Gentlemen, for years past you have been giving away your prerogatives and powers one by one to boards and to commissions, and to this body and to that, until to-day the Congress of the United States is hardly more than a large town meeting. But, in the name of God Almighty, in this proceeding do not give away the last vestige of the honor of the Congress of the United States, as you propose to do. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] has said that the whole matter can be disregarded and has urged that it be dropped. I make the statement upon the authority of the evidence that I will in a moment produce that if you do that, like Banquo's ghost, it will not down, but it will rise and haunt each and every man who proposes that course of action. You may see the fire smoldering, you may see the smoke arising, you may say, "I propose to close the door of the room, because I see no flame," but in doing so, my friends, you are merely postponing the hour of the conflagration. And the house will burn, the conflagration will be exposed, and the people of the United States will have in the open the hearings that we ought to give them without their demand.

Let me show you some of the evidence in this case. I have no high regard, I am frank to say, for the honor of Thomas W. Lawson. However, I do not think it will advance the cause of this investigation to waste any time in speaking my true opinion of this man. Suffice it to say, that he is not a normal man. There is no question in my mind about that, and I want to tell you that I have put in 25 years of my life weighing evidence. As State's attorney I have sent many a man to the penitentiary until the last day of his life with less evidence than there is in this record, that there was a leak to Wall Street from Washington.

Let me call your attention to statements that were made by Mr. Lawson when he appeared before this committee and when he was put under the solemn obligation of an oath that to any man with a conscience should be binding.

When the gentleman says there is no suspicion, let me inquire, how do you remove it, and when did it vanish, and where has it gone?

Here is the statement that he made. I read from page 83. I will say to you that I will not read consecutively, for it would take too much time to cover the various points, and when I get to another page I will tell you.

On page 83 he—Lawson—said:

I am going to proceed on that assumption: That this committee is not holding an investigation; it is not equipped to hold an investigation. I do not believe it is equipped to hold an investigation. I repeat it now. One of the commonest things in Wall Street, where all of these things center, are leaks, Washington leaks, meaning by that advance information in regard to things pertaining to the Government; meaning by that those things that are of such import to the country that they immediately affect the price of the country's securities.

And if the statement is not true, then the tongue that uttered it ought to be palsied.

I mean by that—

He continues—

leaks from the Supreme Court, advance information upon the decisions of the Supreme Court; advance information upon senatorial matters supposed to be of the most profound secrecy; advance information of the acts of Congress or its committees; advance information of Cabinet affairs; and advance information direct from the White House.

Is there no suspicion? Can it be possible that men can come and make these charges under oath and still the cover be drawn over them by the Members of the House?

It seems to me, gentlemen, that it will be the great mistake of this Congress if that is done. But there was much more to his alleged evidence.

On page 110 he said:

For instance, if a responsible banker friend of mine should say to me, as you would say to Mr. HENRY, "Such and such a banker, such and such a Senator, and such and such a Cabinet man are in an account, speculating in steel, for instance; they sold so much the other day and they split up on profits."

And then turn to page 117, we find he says:

I corroborated that. I had more than that. I had a reputable banker, a friend of the other banker, and a friend of mine, and I said, "What do you know about it?" and he said, "I know the banker stated to me that he had not only had this account and others, but had such absolute control of the Cabinet member that he could bring him from Washington to New York or on the telephone at any hour of the day or night," and offered then and there to call him up at half past 1 in the morning to answer these questions.

Mr. Lawson by that statement impugned the honor and integrity of Members of Congress and of every branch of the Government of the United States, and when pressed for answers and for information like a dishonorable man he refused time after time to give the information to the House, but said:

I have it; I will give it to another investigating committee, and I will give the name of the Senator, the Member of Congress, of the banker, and of one who is in a higher position than any of these men.

Mr. FERRIS. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Briefly. My time is limited.

Mr. FERRIS. Would the gentleman from Illinois, an experienced prosecutor, believe Thomas W. Lawson on oath if he told the name of any Member of this Congress?

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. I would not care to pass on that question. [Laughter.]

Just a minute. I am speaking seriously. On my sense of responsibility I say that I have no partisan motive. I have tried to find the facts.

A MEMBER. But you did not get any evidence.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. Very good. If you wish to make that kind of interruption when I am speaking, you can do so. It is all right. Let me say this: I can not pass upon the question of the honesty of Thomas W. Lawson. I was not impressed with it. I was not impressed with his testimony. But is it possible, gentlemen, that a man can come before a committee of Congress and raise his hand to God and swear that he has this information in his possession, that he will disclose to an investigating committee information that involves the honor of every Member of Congress, information that involves the honor of the Senate of the United States, information that involves the honor of a Cabinet officer, and information that involves the honor of one higher than all these, and we still refuse to conduct an investigation and to brand him either as an infamous liar who deserves no place in the company of honorable men or sustain the charge that he has made?

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from Illinois yield to the gentleman from Tennessee?

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. I yield.

Mr. GARRETT. I know my friend desires to be absolutely fair in statement. No statement that Mr. Lawson made would involve the honor of any Congressman, any Representative in Congress.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. It would—

Mr. GARRETT. If a Representative in Congress told him that he knew the name of a Senator and Cabinet officer. There is no charge against any Representative.

Mr. CHIPERFIELD. There is no charge, so far as any sufficient evidence is concerned, except the scurrilous generalities of Lawson that Members of Congress are engaged in these things. There was no evidence except that he said a Member of Congress had information of infamous conduct of public officials in his possession, and that he knew his name, and that he could produce him to the committee. Therefore it puts every Member of Congress under the suspicion that he may be the one who is cognizant of these things. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The SPEAKER. Before the next Member speaks, the Chair must admonish Members that they must not sit in their seats and interject their remarks into the remarks of the gentleman who has the floor. It does not give the man who has the floor a fair chance. It creates a disturbance, and is a nuisance. That is the rule.

Another thing, the Chair asks every Member of the House to keep order here to-day. Of course everybody knows that there is a very exciting question under discussion. Keep out of the aisles, and if you want to talk, go out of doors. [Applause.]

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER].

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. FOSTER] is recognized for five minutes.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that any Member of this House, on either side of this aisle, will contend for a moment that resolution 429 should be adopted by this House.

There were three charges, recited in this resolution, made by Mr. Lawson. One was that the Capitol had been wallowing in graft, that Members would change their bank accounts if they knew this investigation was going to come, and that there would be such a crowd at the hearings that there would not be a quorum in the House when it met on Tuesday morning, January 2.

Now, what are the facts? In answer to questions asked of Mr. Lawson he made the statement that what he meant in reference to Members being present at the hearings, with not a quorum in the House, was that they just wanted to hear what was said over there. He had no charge to make against them.

Another charge, that they would shift their bank accounts, was explained by his saying that a Member might invest some money belonging to some one else or make an investment, bought or sold some stocks or bonds, and had the proceeds of such transaction in the bank and would hurry to get that money over to whomsoever it belonged that he was doing business for, and not to his own account. So, gentlemen, I want you to understand that, in my judgment, there is not one scintilla of evidence of a charge against a Member of this House that has been sustained in resolution 429.

The only question, I will say to this House in frankness, that may arise in deciding this question in reference to a further investigation has been whether or not the House should appoint a committee that would call Mr. Lawson before them and ask him that question, "Who is that Member of Congress who told you these things?"—not these rumors that are floating around in the committee and everywhere else. Mr. Lawson says he will give the Member's name.

Mr. IGOE. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOSTER. I have but five minutes, but I will yield for just a short question.

Mr. IGOE. What I want to find out is, can we punish him for contempt now?

Mr. FOSTER. I am not a lawyer, but I have been listening to lawyers talking upon the question, and, from the experience of this House in the past in the cases that have been had for contempt, it does not seem to me, looking at it from a layman's standpoint, there is much to do with Mr. Lawson in that regard; but I hope there is. In thinking over this matter, I have prepared such a resolution as would permit the Speaker of this House to appoint a committee that would call Mr. Lawson before it and ask him the question, Who is the Member of Congress that will give this information?—not against the Member of the House, because he does not say that, but he says he will mention a Member of Congress who told him about the transactions of a Cabinet officer, a banker, and a United States Senator. We have no right to investigate, as I understand, or to attempt an investigation, if there is wrongdoing charged against a Member at the other end of this Capitol. It is their duty to investigate their own Members, and not ours; so that if Mr. Lawson can state it, and will state it, the only question in my mind is whether we should not give him that opportunity to do so. And with that view in my mind—my own view entirely, not the views of the majority of the Committee on Rules—I have prepared such a resolution in such shape that I hope it may be considered, if necessary, and that Mr. Lawson may be called before that special committee and given the opportunity to answer. But I do say that I believe, from the experience that we have had in the past, that we will get the same results in the future with that kind of a resolution.

Mr. CROSSER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOSTER. In just a minute. But if he does mention the names, then this committee can proceed and fully investigate whether there is any truth in the charges that this man has made.

Mr. CROSSER. You say you are going to introduce such a resolution?

Mr. FOSTER. I have prepared such a resolution, with the view of introducing it if this matter is disposed of to-day.

Mr. CROSSER. It will be of some interest.

Mr. FOSTER. But I want to say to the gentleman from Ohio and those on this side of the House that, so far as I am concerned—and I think I speak for every member of the majority of the Committee on Rules—that they are willing to consider whatever resolutions may come before it in reference to this matter. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Illinois has expired.

Mr. FOSTER. May I have just a minute more?

Mr. HENRY. I yield one more minute to the gentleman, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. FOSTER. But, Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House—

Mr. DOWELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman yield?

Mr. FOSTER. I can not yield.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. FOSTER. But, Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, let us not besmirch the character of men or put a stigma upon men by mentioning them, as has been done in this resolution—men who, I believe from the evidence, have shown that they are innocent. But it goes broadcast to the country that this man's name has been mentioned in connection with these matters. It is a serious thing to bring up a man's name when there is no evidence to show that there is one iota of proof against that man. Let us pay no attention to the scandalmonger, wherever he may be. God knows we have all seen enough of such a creature. Let us have the truth, but not the idle words of the scandalmonger doing his dirty work in the House of Representatives or any other place. [Applause.]

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from New York [Mr. BENNET]. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Speaker, I decline interruptions during my time.

I desire first to answer the very proper and pertinent inquiry addressed by the gentleman from Missouri [Mr. IGOE]. I heard the gentleman's inquiry, and it is not necessary for him to repeat it.

Mr. IGOE. I just wanted to ask, if the gentleman would permit me to suggest, that some of us are interested in this thing, and we do not think it ought to be confined to the members of the Committee on Rules, and I have some more questions that I should like to ask somebody.

Mr. BENNET. I will answer the gentleman's one inquiry, which is all I can do as a member of the minority. The gentleman asked, in substance, whether the adoption of this report would foreclose any proceedings against Mr. Lawson for what occurred before the committee. From 25 years of legal experience, and having read every precedent in Hinds' Precedents relating to this subject, I say to the gentleman from Missouri and to the House, if you adopt this report, you can not then punish Thomas W. Lawson for contempt for these reasons: First, no man has ever been punished for contempt by either the House or the Senate until he was called before the committee and given a chance to purge himself of contempt; and when we adopt this resolution we lose control of the subject matter of the investigation committed to us by the House. We were directed to report within 10 days. We have reported within 10 days, and if our report is accepted we become functus officio.

In the second place, no man can be convicted for refusing to answer a question unless that question is both pertinent and material. The case of Hallet Kilbourne, the case of Anderson against Dunn, the case of Chapman, all the cases that have gone into the courts hold that.

Now, what does this report say? It says that nothing material was developed. Therefore, if you adopt this report, you adopt a report saying that there was nothing pertinent and material before the committee, and that the questions asked of Mr. Lawson were not pertinent or material to any matter of substance, and you can not convict him of contempt. Therefore, if you adopt the report of the majority of the committee, Mr. Lawson has had his opportunity to tell us where we can go, and we have consented to go. [Laughter.]

Now, I imagine the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] will develop the fact that a leak was proved, therefore I will not take time to demonstrate that; but I will demonstrate, calmly and unemotionally as a lawyer, that the conduct of the members of the majority justify the reasonable deduction that they are afraid to investigate the leak. [Applause on the Republican side.] And from that statement I hasten to absolve by name the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CANTRELL], because he is not. I am not surprised that not one member of the majority has read to the House one line of the testimony. I am going to read some.

The impression has been given you that Mr. Lawson will not make this public. Mr. Lawson took a proper legal ground. He consulted counsel. He informed our committee that our sole duty was to find out whether that resolution ought to be reported, and that we had no power to investigate, and he was legally correct. Then Mr. CANTRELL, of Kentucky, in a plain, blunt way, asked him this question, which is to be found on page 148 of the hearings:

Mr. CANTRELL. Mr. Lawson, yesterday, as I recall your testimony, you declined to divulge the name of this Member of Congress or this

Cabinet officer to this committee on the ground that this committee was simply holding a preliminary investigation, and that this was not the proper committee to give those names to?

Now, I ask you, in a spirit of all fairness, because your answer might have some bearing on the action of this committee in making its report to the House. In case this committee favorably reports this resolution to the House, and the House adopts this resolution, and in accordance with that resolution the Speaker of the House appoints a committee to make a final and thorough investigation, will you now agree to give that committee the name of that Member of Congress and that member of the Cabinet to whom you referred in your testimony yesterday?

Mr. LAWSON. I will.

Mr. CANTRELL. You will?

Mr. LAWSON. I will.

Mr. CANTRELL. All right; that is all.

And that ought to have been all. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. RAKER. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNET. I have declined to yield to the House.

Mr. RAKER. I wish to ask the gentleman a legal question.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FITZGERALD). The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. BENNET. We are most of us lawyers. We know that there are witnesses who can prove things and witnesses who can not prove things. The majority called about all the witnesses in Washington who could not prove anything, but they specifically refused, declined, and neglected to call the people who could prove things. [Applause on the Republican side.] Of course, if you leave out all the material witnesses, you can not make out a case. Now, who were the material witnesses? The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOD] gave their names to the committee, and he gave their addresses. Here is one: Mr. McKinnon, of Thompson & McKinnon, of Chicago. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOD] stated that he received the following telegram from Oshkosh, Wis.:

Wrote you fully to-day. The message came from R. C. McKinnon, of Thompson & McKinnon, addressed to Ralph R. Hartley, manager of the branch office located here. Message came from outside wire, not from service wire, and submitted in strict confidence. Saw the message myself, but can not give it to you more accurately than stated in my letter.

S. B. FRIDAY.

Mr. McKinnon was not called.

Mr. Baruch was directed by the committee to bring his books, documents, and papers of the 19th and 20th of December. It was not done, and it was not insisted on. The Western Union and the Postal Telegraph Cos. were to bring their messages of the 19th and 20th of December. It was not done, and it was not insisted on. Furthermore, this leak occurred prior to noon on the 20th of December. The note was not given out for publication until about 4 o'clock in the afternoon of the 20th. At half past 11 in the morning of the 20th of December that information was received in New York. There is no doubt about that. On page 38 of the record is an item which appeared in a news bulletin in New York City that morning. It said:

The renewed selling of the market is due to reports received by brokers' private wires from Washington to the effect that the administration will in the near future address to the belligerents some suggestions and proposals in regard to peace. Nothing definite is obtainable in administration circles.

Now, we brought over from New York Mr. Reilly, the man who wrote that item, and we asked him if he had any information on which to base it. He said he had. He said he received it from a newspaper man, but he was not even asked the name of the newspaper man. He said even before he received the confidential report from his own representative here the market had been commencing to break, showing that the information of this peace note, which had been guarded with the utmost care, with the usual care in the Printing Office, had been received in New York.

Why, Mr. Speaker, the situation is this: That every time the majority members of the committee came to the point where they could start to pick up the bricks necessary to trace the information directly back to Washington they stopped. Why did they stop? The majority has been very generous in exonerating ourselves, but here is what Mr. Lawson charged specifically, and his charge was not directed entirely at us; it was directed toward all the officials in Washington. Mr. HARRISON, on page 162, volume 4, asked this question:

Mr. HARRISON. Now, in this resolution, the latter part of it, it says that in the statement of December 31, 1916, you stated:

"The good old Capitol has been wallowing in Wall Street leak grafts for 40 years, wallowing hale and hearty."

You spelled that word "Capitol" with an "o." Did you mean in Washington, or in the Capitol?

Mr. LAWSON. Capitol?

Mr. HARRISON. Yes; in that building over there, or did you mean the whole city?

Mr. LAWSON. No; I meant in Washington.

Mr. HARRISON. In the whole city?

Mr. LAWSON. Yes.
Mr. HARRISON. Including them all?
Mr. LAWSON. Yes.

Here is where we—and not only we, but members of the Cabinet and the Executive—have been charged with bringing about the condition through which the people who traded on the stock exchange in the city of New York on the 19th, 20th, and 21st of December lost over \$63,000,000, according to the figures taken from the New York Times. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from New York has expired.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Alabama [Mr. HEFLIN].

Mr. HEFLIN. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I am ready to instruct the Rules Committee or to raise a special committee to investigate the conduct of Government officials charged with violating the law with regard to "leaks" and speculation. I want an earnest and sincere investigation and not the prolongation of a farcical performance to further the partisan purposes of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOD]. He has had six days in which to make good his charge, and he has produced no testimony and given no witnesses who could or would give evidence to the committee. The man who makes a serious charge against a Government official ought to produce the evidence or withdraw the charge. The gentleman from Indiana has involved in his rumors the names of men high in authority in this country, men of high character and unimpeachable integrity, and he has failed utterly to produce one scintilla of evidence against any one of them. [Applause on the Democratic side.] The Rules Committee has a resolution before it now which authorizes an investigation of "leak" charges, and if any of you gentlemen on that side have any evidence to offer, come forward with it. [Applause.]

Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] insinuates that some Member on this side is involved. Any Member of this House who makes an insinuation of that kind owes it to this House and to the country to name that man, and if he fails to do so after making the insinuation he brands himself as a man unworthy of the respect of the membership of this body. [Applause.]

Now, Mr. Speaker, any man who reads the various statements made by Thomas W. Lawson about this matter must agree that he has failed to furnish any evidence to the Committee on Rules, or to the newspapers of the country.

I call upon the gentlemen here to-day, if you know anything about these charges or anything against any Member of Congress in connection with them, I beg you to come forward and testify. But if you do not know anything, in the name of all that is decent and honest, I beg you not to injure the good names of honorable men by the use of false rumors.

If you have any testimony, give it to this House and to the country; but if you have none, quit trying to deceive the country with a contemptible play at politics.

Are you Republicans trying to embarrass the President in his efforts to bring about peace between the warring nations of the Old World? Would you have him refrain from suggesting to the nations at war that this peace-loving Nation is anxious to see peace restored because you are afraid that peace negotiations would interfere with the business of the stock exchange?

Gentlemen on the other side, let me say to you now, that if it is your purpose to besmirch this administration by such contemptible rumors as some seem willing to peddle around, you will meet with miserable failure. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Woodrow Wilson stands at the head of the majority party in the United States. He is loved and trusted by the people of the whole country, and your puny effort to play politics at the cost of truth and common honesty will be repudiated by patriots throughout the United States. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Let me close with this statement, Mr. Speaker: If you gentlemen, any of you, can produce the evidence to establish the charges that so far rest only on rumor, I beg you to produce it or be honest enough to say that you can not do so. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I yield two minutes to the gentleman from Oklahoma [Mr. FERRIS].

Mr. FERRIS. Mr. Speaker, if the man who started this propaganda, Thomas W. Lawson, were a responsible, truthful, frank man, it would be the duty of this House to follow this investigation to the very last note and find out if in truth there is anything in his several unsupported and in all probability untrue charges. There is not a man on the Committee on Rules who heard him, and I doubt if there is a man on either side of the aisle who read the testimony, who will rise in his place and say that Thomas W. Lawson dealt either with truth, candor, or

frankness in any single statement he made before the committee. The other gentleman, an honored Member of this House, who is responsible in part for this investigation is the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. WOOD, and he acted on an unsupported, uncorroborated, unknown, unheard of letter from somebody named A. Curtis. I pause and ask Mr. WOOD who is A. Curtis, and where is A. Curtis? I pause and ask any Member on the Republican side who is A. Curtis, and where is A. Curtis?

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Speaker, I shall be glad to answer the gentleman's question.

Mr. FERRIS. I would like to hear what the gentleman has to say.

Mr. BENNET. A. Curtis is a gentleman in New York who wrote a letter to Mr. WOOD, dated six days after Mr. WOOD introduced his resolution, in which he said in the first line—

The Democratic majority of the House will not, I presume, permit the adoption of your resolution of inquiry.

[Laughter.]

Mr. FERRIS. The frankness and candor of the answer of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BENNET] is only equivalent to the answers of Mr. Lawson himself. [Laughter.] One word further. The attitude of the Republican side of this House in a word is this: They would ask the Congress at the short session of Congress to leave its well-known duties, the passage of the appropriation bills and getting ready to adjourn on March 4, and follow off in a weird, nonsensical investigation of Thomas W. Lawson and A. Curtis, whoever the latter may be; and fearful that some Member of the House may accept with more seriousness than the gentleman from New York [Mr. BENNET] would have them take his answer as to who A. Curtis is, I want to say that the only A. Curtis found in New York was Mr. Alexander Curtis, who came before the committee and said that he wrote no such letter. It is time to stop following off after false gods and get our appropriation bills through. It is time to ring down the curtain on this entire fiasco.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FITZGERALD). The time of the gentleman from Oklahoma has expired.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I yield 10 minutes to the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER].

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I do not care what kind of a resolution we adopt, but if we do not adopt some kind of a resolution which will make Mr. Lawson either "put up or shut up," we shall deserve everything that will be said about us all through this country. There is probably not a Member from the North who has not had the experience of finding among his constituents that there is a suspicion abroad that Congressmen are crooks. I have lectured over and over again to my constituents, and I have told them that in the 14 years of my service I have only three times seen suspicious actions on the part of any of my fellow Members. I have seen looks of incredulity come over the faces of my audience, and I have realized that while they thought I was honest they believed my associates were not. Most of us have had that same experience. Most of us have had people say to us, "Oh, I know you are all right; but a lot of those fellows down in Washington are getting something out of this thing." We know that the fellows down in Washington are doing no such thing; but it is just such stupid chloroforming as is being attempted now which creates that idea in the public mind. Do I think that Mr. Lawson will reveal anything? I do not. I think he will name a Congressman as his informant of the fact that rumor connected a certain Cabinet officer with the leak. He might name me. If he did, I should deny the truth of his allegation. But suppose that it were a fact that I had given Mr. Lawson this information, and that he were to name me as his informant, what of it? I should get up and say, "Yes; I did say there was such a rumor, and what of it? It is the fact." Now, my friends, it would be a very disagreeable thing if I were a Cabinet officer to have my name mentioned in such a connection as this. Very likely a Cabinet officer's name might be mentioned. Even so, I have no doubt that that Cabinet officer would get up and convince the committee and the country at once that he knew nothing about these matters with relation to which Mr. Lawson says that some Congressman told him that some Cabinet officer was cognizant. That would end the whole matter so far as Mr. Lawson's allegations as to that Cabinet officer are concerned.

But, Mr. Speaker, this whole business has not been properly investigated. The testimony shows at least 16 men in the Government pay in Washington who knew the contents of that note before it was given to the newspaper men. Out of those 16 men only two have been interrogated by the committee. I shall proceed to enumerate them. When that note arrived in Mr. Lansing's hands—and we do not know how many people may have been consulted about it before it reached his hands—Mr. Lansing called Mr. Polk and Mr. Woolsey in consultation, and

they sent for three stenographers. Those stenographers were Mr. R. C. Sweet, Mr. H. D. House, and Mr. F. E. Vestal. Neither Mr. Polk, Mr. Woolsey, Mr. Sweet, Mr. House, nor Mr. Vestal was called before this committee to find out whether any one of them might have accidentally let something leak. The message was put into cipher by Mr. Salmon, the Chief of the Index Bureau, and his assistant, Mr. J. H. Bean.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARDNER. Yes.

Mr. GARRETT. The gentleman recalls, I am sure, that the Secretary of State made the statement before the committee that he had caused an investigation to be made?

Mr. GARDNER. Yes; but I feel it would be more thorough to have had them under oath. I had forgotten for the moment, however, that the Secretary had made that statement. That makes 8. Then, the galley proof was read by John H. James, Chief of the Information Bureau, and his assistant named Duncan. That makes 10 men who knew the contents of the note after it reached Mr. Lansing and before it went to the Government Printing Office. Mr. William J. McEvoy, of the Government Printing Office, testified that he had read the note, and he is the only other witness of that whole lot who has been called, except Mr. Lansing. Mr. McEvoy said a copy preparer and two division chiefs in addition to himself had seen the note in its entirety, and that a number of compositors had seen it in fractions so small that it would be impossible for them to give an intelligent statement of its contents. There we have 14 men, only two of whom have been examined. We also know that Ambassador Willard knew about that note, because the fact appears in the testimony, and President Wilson makes the sixteenth.

Now, my friends, when I appeared before the Rules Committee I said, "I think this committee ought to go to President Wilson and say, 'Mr. President, do you object?'—at least I think I told the committee substantially this; my recollection is that it is in my evidence—"to saying with whom you consulted?" Then summon those gentlemen with whom the President consulted and say, 'Did you by any chance let this cat out of the bag by accident?'" I pointed out to the committee that that line of investigation would start us along in the right way from one end of the line. I advised, furthermore, a simultaneous start from the other end. Investigate in New York; find out who has made money out of this fall in prices, and compare the course of the stock-market movement and get experts. One broker will tell you one thing and another broker will tell you another. Make a comparison of their views. You are not stock-market experts on the Committee on Rules. Get some experts to help you.

I understand that you sent for certain brokers' sales slips. You impounded certain accounts of the New York Stock Exchange. I am told that you asked for the commission brokers' bills of a certain party to see what his transactions actually totaled. You had all this evidence at hand, but you never examined the documents which you impounded; and therefore I say to you, Mr. Speaker, that this investigation has not been conducted in a way to find out anything. Even with a thorough investigation you would have the greatest difficulty in finding anything out. That peace note was sent to 43 different capitals—the identical message—but it was not sent in our really secret cipher. It was sent in what is known as the "blue" cipher, and the Secretary of State has told me that the key to that blue cipher is probably held by many individuals not in the service of the United States Government. Now, I am going to read my correspondence with the Secretary of State.

Mr. BENNET. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARDNER. I have only a minute left, and I should like to continue.

Mr. BENNET. Is the gentleman aware of the fact that the Secretary furnished information showing it could not have gotten across the water and back again in time. That is in the record.

Mr. GARDNER. Very likely; but if the key to the cipher is in the possession of people not in the employ of the United States Government the dispatch could be deciphered here before it ever got across the water. I filed this correspondence yesterday with the Committee on Rules to be printed with my evidence. It reads as follows:

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,
Washington, D. C., January 9, 1917.

MY DEAR MR. SECRETARY: In conversation yesterday I understood you to say that the Government has three ciphers: First, a cipher for use exclusively in communicating with our ambassadors and ministers in person; second, a cipher which is used for communicating with our embassies and legations abroad when the message transmitted is not to be delivered word for word; third, a cipher which is used for messages which are to be delivered to foreign Governments word for word.

I understood you to say that ciphers No. 1 and No. 2, as enumerated above, are well-kept secrets, but the key to cipher No. 3 is probably held by many individuals not in the service of the United States Government. I understood you to say that cipher No. 3 was used in transmitting the "Peace note" to some 43 different legations and embassies of the United States. It was necessary, if I comprehend you correctly, to use this cipher for the reason that the use of either of the other ciphers would at once have resulted in the destruction of their secrecy. I think you explained this as follows, to wit: When a message is delivered to a foreign Government word for word, it becomes an easy matter for that foreign Government to compare the aforesaid message with the coded cablegram by which it was forwarded from the United States. A comparison of the coded cablegram with the actual text of the dispatch would enable experts to discover the cipher code. For this reason it was necessary to use a cipher about whose secrecy the State Department was not solicitous.

In reply to my question you were good enough to say that I was at liberty to communicate the above information to the Committee on Rules. Before doing so in an official manner, however, I am anxious to know whether the above statement of the case is correct. If so, I should like your permission to furnish this letter and your answer thereto as a part of my evidence before the Committee on Rules.

Very respectfully,

A. P. GARDNER.

HON. ROBERT LANSING,
Secretary of State, Washington, D. C.

THE SECRETARY OF STATE,
Washington, January 9, 1917.

HON. A. P. GARDNER,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. GARDNER: I am in receipt of your letter of the 9th relative to the ciphers used by this department. I have read your understanding of our conversation, which is substantially correct. I see no objection to furnishing a copy of your letter to the Committee on Rules, if you so desire.

Very truly, yours,

ROBERT LANSING.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to put the rest of this letter and Mr. Lansing's answer into the Record as a part of my remarks.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Chairman, I will state to the gentleman from Kansas that the remainder of the time will be consumed in one address on this side.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Chairman, I yield five minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. LONGWORTH]. [Applause.]

Mr. LONGWORTH. Mr. Speaker, in spite of the fact that this committee has divided upon partisan lines on this question, in spite of the fact that partisanship has been brought into this debate originally by my good friend from Mississippi [Mr. HARRISON] and later particularly by the brilliant court jester of this administration [laughter and applause on the Republican side], I approach and have approached this question entirely as a nonpartisan, as a Member of the House of Representatives, and one jealous of the honor and dignity of this House and of this Government, dominated, though it is, in every branch by the Democratic Party. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] has suggested that we reason calmly. I agree with him entirely. Let us reason calmly as to where we will be left in the event that the report of the majority of this House is accepted. Now, the facts are, Mr. Speaker, that charges, vague, it is true, but charges which have spread throughout this country, have been made involving the integrity and the character of officials high in the service of this Government. Moreover, the authority and dignity of a great committee of this House has been treated with absolute contempt. Mr. Speaker, can we afford, on the one hand, by inaction to lend any possible color to those charges, and, on the other hand, can we leave these insults unanswered?

It is charged that there was a leak, and I am afraid there has been a leak—

Mr. GORDON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. LONGWORTH. I regret I can not yield. I have only five minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. LONGWORTH. I am afraid there has been a leak, if I judge only by the peculiar antics of the New York stock market as a result of what must have been advance information. Now, my friends, it is not a remarkable thing that there should have been a leak somewhere, at some time, and by some one, considering the wonderful opportunity for gain that might come from any advance information looking to a movement in the direction of peace. It was not a question of speculation, my friends, as to what effect such a leak might have upon the stock market. It had been conclusively proven before as to just what effect the merest hint of peace would have upon stocks and the basic securities of this country. It is a regrettable and lamentable fact, but a fact, nevertheless, that to a dominating extent our present prosperity and the value of our securities is dependent

upon the prolongation of this disastrous war in Europe. [Applause on the Republican side.]

The merest hint a few days before this as a result of the German note that by some possibility there might be peace resulted in the loss of from 10 to 15 per cent of the value of practically all stocks. Did not any reasoning man therefore know that a proposal of peace or even a mere suggestion of peace coming from the President of the United States would result, as it did, in a loss of from 20 to 30 per cent in the value of the basic securities of this Nation? Now, much has been said about Mr. Thomas W. Lawson, a farmer-financier, as he describes himself, a blatherskite, and fakir, as many men believe him.

But the question we have to decide, gentlemen, is not whether his testimony before the Rules Committee was of value, or even as to whether it was credible; it is to decide whether the testimony he has agreed with a member of this committee to give and the names he has agreed to furnish will not throw light upon whether there has been a leak and who has profited by that leak. I say to you, gentlemen of this House, and I say it from a purely nonpartisan standpoint, that we can not afford to stop where we are now. We have not gained anything practical. We may gain little eventually, but we have all to gain and nothing to lose by letting in the light on this proposition. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I wish to yield two minutes to the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD].

Mr. GARD. Mr. Speaker, there has been some inquiry on the part of Members of the House as to the law pertaining to these so-called congressional investigations, and I desire, therefore, to call the attention of the membership of the House to sections 101, 102, 103, and 104 of the Revised Statutes of the United States, 1878, second edition, which during my time I shall ask to read. They are as follows:

SEC. 101. The President of the Senate, the Speaker of the House of Representatives, or a Chairman of a Committee of the Whole, or of any committee of either House of Congress, is empowered to administer oaths to witnesses in any case under their examination.

SEC. 102. Every person who having been summoned as a witness by the authority of either House of Congress to give testimony or to produce papers upon any matter under inquiry before either House, or any committee of either House of Congress, willfully makes default, or who, having appeared, refuses to answer any question pertinent to the question under inquiry, shall be deemed guilty of a misdemeanor, punishable by a fine of not more than \$1,000 nor less than \$100 and imprisonment in a common jail for not less than 1 month nor more than 12 months.

SEC. 103. No witness is privileged to refuse to testify to any fact, or to produce any paper, respecting which he shall be examined by either House of Congress, or by any committee of either House, upon the ground that his testimony to such fact or his production of such paper may tend to disgrace him or otherwise render him infamous.

SEC. 104. Whenever a witness summoned as mentioned in section 102 fails to testify, and the facts are reported to either House, the President of the Senate or the Speaker of the House, as the case may be, shall certify the fact under the seal of the Senate or House to the district attorney for the District of Columbia, whose duty it shall be to bring the matter before the grand jury for their action.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. GARD. If I have the time.

Mr. LENROOT. By taking that course you avoid requiring Mr. Lawson to give the names, but merely arraign him for a misdemeanor.

Mr. GARD. I am simply reading what the law is.

Mr. LENROOT. I would like the gentleman's construction as a lawyer. He can not purge himself of contempt under that proceeding by giving the names.

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. GARD] has expired. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] is recognized. [Applause.]

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I?

The SPEAKER. Fourteen minutes.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, the House is to-day confronted with a grave responsibility and an important duty.

For many days rumors have been afloat and charges made that Government officials had violated the secrecy with respect to grave international questions, and that Government officials and others had profited by violating the confidence the country placed in them.

I have believed from the time these charges were first published that the importance of purging the Government of such a serious scandal was an important duty. I do not think we should rest the charges of the scandal on the statements of Thomas W. Lawson, of Boston. The charges were published and generally believed throughout the country before Lawson became prominent in connection with them. His refusal to testify to important matters that he says came to his knowledge did not leave the committee and does not leave the House without information upon which the House ought now to proceed

to order a searching investigation that will clear up this whole matter and purge the Government of the United States of one of the most serious scandals that has had wide publicity with respect to our Government in half a century.

The last witness called before the Committee on Rules, the news editor of the Wall Street Journal, Mr. Reilly, testified that on the 20th day of December, at about 11.30 o'clock in the forenoon, one of his reporters brought him news that the rumor was on the Street, received over the private wire of a Washington broker, that President Wilson was about to send a peace note to the belligerent powers. This information was at once placed upon the ticker and given to the financial world by the Wall Street Journal. That testimony is undisputed and unexplained. It is in evidence that the firm with which he is connected, F. A. Connelly & Co., brokers, of Washington, have a private wire to New York. This shows the leak and imposes the duty upon the House to order the appointment of a committee to make a searching investigation as to who the leaker was and as to who the beneficiaries of the leak were.

Officials of the Government are under suspicion. An investigation should be had that will purge the Government of that suspicion, no matter who it hits.

It is important to the people that public questions should not be so conducted as to yield private profit, and the importance is magnified when such questions grow out of our international relations. Every phase of the conduct of such questions as these should be above suspicion.

The Committee on Rules early in its proceedings took steps to preserve important testimony that might be important to an investigating committee in connection with these charges. Stock exchanges and stock brokers throughout the country have been notified to preserve all their records that would have a bearing upon the names of those who took advantage of the stock market at the time the advance information as to the note was affecting the market. This testimony has not been taken. The committee was informed that records have been ordered preserved that will disclose the names of the beneficiaries of the leak, even though the transactions were not in his proper name.

I am unable to understand, Mr. Speaker, why there should be a moment's hesitation in going to the very bottom of this whole matter.

Mr. Lawson testified that he had information that he would not give to the Committee on Rules, but would give to a special investigating committee. He said the information he had was of the gravest importance. This is what he says:

Mr. LAWSON. But this Congressman, in all earnestness, stated to me the seriousness of these names becoming public, and he stated it to me so strongly that I agreed with him. So much so, that I did not believe that this investigation should go further. Now, there is the one point I want to make, that if there is a drastic investigation to ascertain and furnish these—to ascertain who were the "leakers" and who were the beneficiaries, let the results be what they may, I am willing under those circumstances to say that it would be more serious for me not to give the committee that information than it would be to give it to them.

In answer to questions in the examination, he further says:

Question. Is it the name of an official of the Government?

Mr. LAWSON (continuing). But a name the mention of which might be more serious than either of the other two. Now, when I say to you that a Member of Congress thought the situation was so serious and showed it to me to be so serious, that we should not have these things in public now—even looking at it that perhaps in 30 days they might not be as dangerous—that is the only thing that has influenced me.

Question. In what way were they dangerous—to the stock market, or to the Government, or in what way?

Mr. LAWSON. Oh, no; not the stock market; I said to the Nation and to the administration—or to the administration I will put it. But I mean dangerous in a big, broad way. They might be damaging to our national affairs; they might create situations that would be most embarrassing. Now, I mean that just as fairly as you asked me the question; and I believe now, after going through this investigation as far as we have gone, that it would be a very serious affair, the bare mentioning of it. And that is my only reason for withholding it.

At another place Mr. Lawson states in answer to a question:

Question. Now, I ask you in a spirit of all fairness, because your answer might have some bearing on the action of this committee in making its report to the House. In case this committee favorably reports this resolution to the House, and the House adopts that resolution, and in accordance with that resolution the Speaker of the House appoints a committee to make a final and thorough investigation, will you now agree to give that committee the name of that Member of Congress and that member of the Cabinet to whom you referred in your testimony yesterday?

Mr. LAWSON. I will.

Question. You will?

Mr. LAWSON. I will.

Testimony of this character may lead to other important evidence.

Now, Mr. Speaker, if the motion to lay the Wood resolution on the table is voted down, I will offer, as a substitute, the following resolution, which I send to the Clerk's desk:

Resolved, That a committee of five Representatives be appointed by the Speaker of the House to investigate and make report as to whether

anyone with the executive or legislative branches of the Government of the United States profited financially, either directly or indirectly, by the fluctuations in the stock market occurring on Wednesday and Thursday, December 20 and 21, 1916, by reason of any advance information as to the President's note of December 18, 1916, or the two interpretations concerning the said note given to the public from the office of the Secretary of State; also, by public officials between November 15 and December 23, 1916.

And for such purpose it shall have power to send for persons and papers and enforce their appearance before said committee and to administer oaths, and shall have the right to make report at any time.

That resolution goes to the bottom of the matter.

Is it not more important that the Government should be above suspicion than that any person should remain in its service?

We can not afford here to-day to shield anyone for personal or partisan consideration by refusing to make an investigation of the charges that saturate the atmosphere and throw suspicion on the conduct of the officials of the Government. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman from Kansas has expired.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kansas asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the Record. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, how much time have I remaining?

The SPEAKER. Twenty-nine minutes.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, as a Member of this House I am not willing that this discussion shall go off upon false issues. Let us pause and take our bearings and proceed as becomes Representatives of the people.

Mr. Speaker, in a short time my career in this House will have ended, but I want to testify here to-day that I believe in the integrity and the honor of my colleagues upon both sides of this aisle.

Mr. Speaker, what is the real issue?—and the Democrats are ready to meet those gentlemen and the country on every issue that is involved in this controversy. They are not trying to suppress anything. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. WOOD] on the 22d day of December introduced in this House a resolution, No. 420, and I want the Members to get it and consult it. In that resolution he said:

Resolved, That a committee of five Representatives be appointed by the Speaker of the House to investigate and make report as to whether or not anyone high in the administration of governmental affairs in the United States, or any relative of anyone high in authority in the administration of governmental affairs in the United States, profited financially, either directly or indirectly, by the fluctuation in the stock market occurring on Thursday, December 21, 1916, following the two contradictory interpretations given to the public from the office of the Secretary of State, concerning the note of the President of the United States, dated December 20, 1916, to the belligerent powers.

Gentlemen, that resolution is still pending before the Committee on Rules, and I turn to Mr. WOOD of Indiana and say now, "Come on with your charges and with your testimony, if you have any, and the Rules Committee is ready to investigate it."

He came and he failed. Then what happened? It occurs to the astute gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] that he will abandon this resolution that was introduced, and that he will use the parliamentary machinery of the House to bring here a privileged resolution which was sent to the Committee on Rules; that he will abandon the charge that there has been a leak at the White House or in the State Department, and that he will turn and put the membership of this House under suspicion.

Now, I am not willing for these gentlemen to turn that investigation to one of themselves. And let me appeal to you Democrats here to-day to hear me while I meet these outrageous charges and this infamous political conspiracy against the Democratic administration and the Democratic Party. Ah, one ex-President, Theodore Roosevelt, in the New York Times, says that he will lend his aid and comfort and power to Mr. GARDNER and Mr. WOOD to press this investigation. Why, gentlemen, the President was answering the note of the German Government and was seeking to bring about peace. These gentlemen want to embarrass him and tie his hands. Are you willing to do it? I appeal to you as Democrats, and I appeal to you as patriotic citizens.

What did this gentleman of great parliamentary skill do? Here is your resolution 420 still pending. Take it and read it, and see how far these gentlemen have gone afield. What is the privileged resolution forced through this House by the prostitution of the parliamentary machinery of this body?

Whereas Thomas W. Lawson, of Boston, gave to the public a statement which appears in the daily newspaper under date of December 28 and 29, 1916, in which he says, amongst other things, that "If it was actually believed in Washington there was to be a real investigation of last week's leak there would not be a quorum in either the Senate or House next Monday and a shifting of bank accounts similar to those in the good old sugar investigation days;" and in another statement which appears in the daily press of December 31, 1916, he says, "The good old Capitol has been wallowing in Wall Street leak grafts for 40 years, wallowing hale and hearty."

That is the only charge to be investigated. No charge against the executive department, but an endeavor to switch it to the House of Representatives.

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENRY. I can not yield.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. HENRY. Gentlemen, the committee sat for six days and took testimony, and when it was ended you gentlemen abandoned that resolution, and the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL] offered a substitute which, in effect, said that the resolution should be laid upon the table.

Mr. BENNET. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENRY. No; I can not yield.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman declines to yield.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT] says that the Rules Committee has ended its investigations, and that Thomas W. Lawson—

Mr. LENROOT. The gentleman from Wisconsin made no such statement. He said it had ended its investigation with reference to this resolution.

Mr. HENRY. All right. Now, gentlemen, they tried to make you believe that we have abandoned this investigation. What is the real status of this case? If Mr. WOOD has any testimony, or if you have any, bring it before the Committee on Rules; or if any Member wants to introduce another resolution and send it to that committee, we stand ready to take it up to-morrow and proceed with this investigation.

Mr. FARR. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENRY. No. Now, I defy that side of the House. Introduce your resolution, or come forward with your proof if you have it. [Applause on the Democratic side.] We defy you. You can not do it. Ah, but the gentleman from Wisconsin [Mr. LENROOT], for whom I have an affectionate regard, says that he in confidence proposed to name a man to whom Lawson had talked and who would give us the name of the Congressman and the Cabinet officer.

Mr. LENROOT. The gentleman from Wisconsin did not propose that name in confidence, and the gentleman knows it.

Mr. HENRY. I am glad you release us. Then I say to you, Mr. LENROOT, I am going to give the name; and I say to you now, Mr. LENROOT, bring on Donald McDonald, of Boston, and produce him before the Rules Committee and let him testify.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENRY. No; I can not yield. I say, bring on your witness and he will prove nothing. I said it in the Committee on Rules, and I say it now.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENRY. No; I can not yield.

Mr. LENROOT. The gentleman ought not to make misstatements.

Mr. HENRY. I say more. I say that the Committee on Rules is ready to proceed; and I say that for one, as chairman of that committee, I am ready and willing, and want this House to stand back of me, and we will examine Thomas W. Lawson before the Rules Committee, and if he does not answer and we have the power I am in favor of putting him in the common jail and keeping him there. [Applause.]

Mr. LENROOT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENRY. No; I do not yield. You know that I have never said for an instant that Lawson should not be summoned for contempt. What is our power? What Member can tell here, after a casual reading of that statute, the power of Congress to deal with contempts? Thomas W. Lawson would come again, and he would say, as he said before the Committee on Rules, "If you do not broaden your investigation and make it so extensive that we can investigate the transactions on the New York Stock Exchange, I will stand mute and not answer your questions." He said, in effect, "I don't care a tinker's dam about your leak from the Executive department. What I want is an investigation of the infamies of the stock exchange." Do you gentlemen want it? Are you willing to vote for it?

MANY MEMBERS. Yes! Yes!

Mr. HENRY. All right.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I have got such a resolution, and I will offer it to-day if you vote down this resolution.

Mr. HENRY. Put your resolution in the basket, and the Committee on Rules will be glad to take it up. I am not willing

for these Republican Members here to be slandered and libeled by anyone, even—

Mr. FARR. How about Democrats?

Mr. HENRY. Oh, it is hard to slander the Democrats, because they are above suspicion. Now, Mr. Speaker, this Curtis letter came days after Mr. Wood had introduced his resolution. We must now relegate that letter to the realms of mythological lore. No such man as A. Curtis has been found. No one has been found who will father that infamous and libelous document produced before the Committee on Rules by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Wood]. He will not father it. He is ashamed that he introduced it, I am sure. Yet you ask this committee to take such testimony as that, when you can not find your witness, and you ask them to institute an investigation.

Now, let us reassure ourselves of our ground. Here is the resolution that they want you to adopt to-day. We offer to lay it on the table, just as the Committee on Rules, in effect, did in its deliberations; as the Republicans did when they offered a substitute for it. They abandoned it. It is of as much importance to-day as the original authority will be when the moral slanders are ended in this country.

Ah, it is easy enough to say that some good person in the neighborhood has lost his honor, and besmire the character without giving names, and have every scandal monger in the neighborhood or in the church hunt for somebody of that sort. I have no concealment to make for my colleagues. I have nothing to suppress; I am ready to go forward, if you gentlemen are, and make this investigation. I am ready to let you write any resolution you want to and put it in the basket, and I pledge my sacred word and honor that to-morrow morning the Committee on Rules will be summoned, and we will summon your witnesses and make it as broad as you please. If you have any one witness, produce him, but do not make this contemptible political fight here. [Applause on the Democratic side.] I am standing for the rights of the House. I have no abuse to heap on the head of this poor misguided creature, Thomas W. Lawson. What did he say over and over again. He said, "If you call me before any committee on earth, I can not produce one scintilla of evidence that would be competent evidence that would involve the character of a Senator, a Cabinet officer, of a Representative in Congress, or of any high ambassador to some foreign court." He said he could not do it. He said, "I have no competent evidence to offer; all I can do is to offer you hearsay evidence."

Now, gentlemen, would you have your Committee on Rules report to this House when no evidence has been adduced that you have gambled in Wall Street or on the stock exchange; that you should be investigated and let the author of the original resolution escape from the position in which he has placed himself? What do you want? If you desire an investigation, this is not the way to get it. You can have it; there is no difficulty about that. Resolution 420 is still pending, and these contempt proceedings are still pending before that committee. The gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL], myself, and the gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. GARRETT] are a subcommittee to formulate the procedure. I am ready, Mr. CAMPBELL—

Mr. CAMPBELL. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. HENRY. I can not.

The SPEAKER. It is against the rules for one Member to address another Member by his name.

Mr. CAMPBELL. I waive that if the gentleman will yield.

Mr. HENRY. I can not; I am ready when this debate ends to go into conference with you and to summon Thomas W. Lawson, if we have the power to bring him before the committee.

Mr. LENROOT. If we have the power!

Mr. HENRY. Does not the gentleman think we have the power?

Mr. LENROOT. Absolutely not.

Mr. HENRY. Why, then, do you criticize the committee for not trying to punish him?

Mr. LENROOT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENRY. I will yield for a moment.

Mr. LENROOT. I want to say that the committee lost its power the moment the chairman introduced his motion this morning.

Mr. HENRY. That is the slimmest reason I ever heard. Lost its power! Then introduce another resolution. We will meet you to-morrow. You know it is a quibble and you know that we have not lost the power. We can go ahead with the investigation. I do not want, gentlemen, to burden you with any lengthy argument. How much time have I remaining, Mr. Speaker?

The SPEAKER. The gentleman has five minutes.

Mr. HENRY. I do not want to burden you with a lengthy argument, but I want to assure you that when I make a pledge

to you I intend to carry it out. The gentleman from New York [Mr. BENNET] says we are afraid of an investigation.

Mr. BENNET. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENRY. Yes.

Mr. BENNET. Yes; I said that and I repeat it. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HENRY. Why?

Mr. BENNET. If you are not afraid, you would have summoned McKemman and McDonald, and you would have traced this thing back to its source. [Applause on the Republican side.]

Mr. HENRY. Now, gentlemen, let me tell you that when we had finished the testimony of the last witness yesterday morning the Chair said, "Gentlemen, have you another witness that you want to subpoena or produce? And they said, "No; not one." [Applause on the Democratic side.] Why, my friend ought to be ashamed to come before this House—

Mr. BENNET. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENRY. I can not yield. Look at the record. They were invited again and again to bring the witnesses, and you know it, but you did not do it. [Applause on the Democratic side.] Here is what they know. They know that to investigate from now until doomsday they would not be able to prove anything against a Senator, anything against a Cabinet officer, anything against the President of the United States, or any of his subordinate officials, and they do not want any investigation. [Applause on the Democratic side.] They know that they would fail, but they think they have a political advantage backed up by an irresponsible scandal monger who thinks he has driven the House into a fight, and they are hoping that they may get out of this thing in some sort of an honorable way.

Now, gentlemen, in conclusion—and I address my remarks not only to Democrats but to Republicans—let us here now resolve that whenever these slanders and libels are uttered against Members to-day or hereafter, we will write across the brow of the slanderers and libelers in living letters that may be read everywhere, "Slanderer, liar, coward, and villain," as some of these have proved themselves to be. I ask you to put this resolution on the table where it belongs, and any Member that will introduce a resolution and produce the witnesses, we will go forward and punish any witness who fails to answer our questions.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield to me to ask him a question?

Mr. HENRY. Yes.

Mr. CLARK of Florida. Is it the purpose of the Committee on Rules to go forward under this other resolution and make this investigation?

Mr. HENRY. As far as the chairman is concerned, it is my purpose to go until the end of the 4th of March if anyone can produce any testimony.

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENRY. Yes.

Mr. FIELDS. Is it the purpose of the Committee on Rules to proceed to punish Thomas W. Lawson for contempt or make him answer the questions that he has refused to answer?

Mr. HENRY. Yes.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENRY. No; the gentleman can not make my speech.

Mr. LENROOT. But the gentleman should not speak for the Committee on Rules.

Mr. HENRY. Oh, yes; you do not want to go any further; you do not think we have the power.

Mr. FIELDS. It is the purpose of the committee to do that?

Mr. HENRY. I think we have the power, and if we can not punish him here, we will send him to the district attorney here and let the grand jury deal with him and put him in jail if we can.

Mr. FIELDS. That is the purpose of the committee?

Mr. HENRY. That is the purpose of the committee.

Mr. FIELDS. Then, as I understand it, the chairman of the committee does not consider that he has surrendered any of the rights of the House?

Mr. HENRY. I surrender them? I would not surrender the rights that belong to this House for anything under the sun. I would not waive any right that belongs to you, I stand by you.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENRY. I can not yield.

Mr. LENROOT. Just for one question.

Mr. HENRY. Very well.

Mr. LENROOT. By what authority does the gentleman speak for the Committee on Rules in making the statement he has made?

Mr. HENRY. By the authority that I have never known the Democratic members of this committee, or the Republican members either, to fail to do their duty when they knew it.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas has one minute left.

Mr. HENRY. Gentlemen, let me adjure you, do not be swept away by these things. Your administration is honorable, these Members are honorable, there is no reason for all of this slander and vituperation. Stand by yourselves, defend your own honor, as I know you will, and as your chairman, as your agent, as your trustee, I give you my confidence, and take you into my confidence, and pledge you my sacred word that we will fight this fight through until we have done every thing that the Democratic Party should do. [Applause on the Democratic side.]

Mr. Speaker, I move that resolution 429 do lie on the table.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Texas that House resolution 429 do lie on the table.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, on that I demand the yeas and nays.

Mr. CANTRILL rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Kentucky rise?

Mr. CANTRILL. Mr. Speaker, I rise to make a request, and that request is this: I am not in exact harmony with either side of this controversy, and so voted in the Committee on Rules. I rise for the purpose of making a request to the House for not to exceed 10 minutes in which to make a statement to the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky, a member of the Committee on Rules, asks unanimous consent that the motion to table be withheld for not to exceed 10 minutes, and that he be permitted to make a statement in those 10 minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. CANTRILL. Mr. Speaker and gentlemen of the House, I want to say to the House that I would not ask for this privilege at this time except that I stand in a position alone as a member of the Committee on Rules, and I did not feel that I had the right to ask either side of this controversy for time because, of course, the time should be equally divided. I want to thank the House for the privilege of making this statement. I want to state that in the Committee on Rules I voted against the proposition to lay this resolution on the table. I ought to make that statement, I think, for this reason: This Committee on Rules is not making this investigation upon its own volition. It is making the investigation under the direct order of the House. I will say that as a member of the committee and as a Member of this House, in the beginning I would not have dignified these resolutions with an investigation by the Committee on Rules, but the House of Representatives thought differently and they instructed the Committee on Rules to proceed with the investigation. The Committee on Rules in accordance with the order of the House proceeded with the investigation. It is not my purpose now to criticize any Member of this House or any member of this administration, or to criticize anyone, because there has not been one single bit of evidence, so far presented to the Committee on Rules, which would in any way incriminate any Member of Congress or any member of the administration, and as one Member of the House and as a member of the Democratic Party I am not afraid to have every member of the Democratic administration go on record before the world in any examination, anywhere, as to what he may have done. [Applause.] But the facts in the case are these: The Committee on Rules had not gone into this investigation until by a vote of the House it was directed to do so. The Committee on Rules in proceeding with this investigation has absolutely no evidence, no scintilla of evidence, to incriminate anyone except one witness, Mr. Lawson, who comes before the Committee on Rules and, by insinuations and innuendo and by indirect statements, says that he will give to another committee made in the future the name of a Congressman who said certain things about certain members of this administration, Cabinet officers and others. The motion that I entered in the Committee on Rules and what I think ought to be done is this: This Committee on Rules is your agent, acting under your advice, and it was my idea that the Committee on Rules should report back to this House that they had received absolutely no intimation except from one witness and that witness declined to give the testimony to the Committee on Rules whereby the committee and this House could act intelligently.

Now, I think that report should have been made back to this House and then let the House determine what they would do with this witness, whether or not they would force him by giving to your agent, the Committee on Rules, the power to extract this testimony from him. [Applause.] Now, I think

that is the correct procedure. I think so far as the dignity of this House is concerned that there is much more involved here than this mere investigation. Let the American Congress determine to-day for all time to come whether or not some citizen, some individual in the United States, can stand up in the public press with paid advertisements and heap calumny upon Members of Congress, and then a duly authorized committee of Congress to investigate those charges are met with the defiance that he will not testify. Let this Congress to-day, if it has the power, instruct the Committee on Rules to bring back Mr. Lawson before that committee and let that committee submit in writing the questions which Mr. Lawson failed to answer before the Committee on Rules and let that committee undertake to force him to answer them, and if he does not answer them let the Committee on Rules cite Mr. Lawson before the bar of this House and let the American Congress say whether it has more power [applause] than Mr. Lawson. What kind of report do we know to make to the House? We are acting as your agent. You told us to make this investigation. We have examined witness after witness, and there is not a particle of evidence to indict any member of the Democratic administration or any Member of Congress on either side of this aisle, not a particle of evidence; but here is a witness who says that he would tell. Now force him to tell, if you have the power. [Applause.] I am not a lawyer, I am just a plain farmer, but this Congress is made up of a lot of the best lawyers in the United States. Can not you gentlemen who are lawyers draft a resolution? If you can not draft a resolution, then this Congress ought to pass a law now, as soon as possible, to force testimony to be given before the committees of Congress.

Mr. HENRY. Will the gentleman yield just a moment? If the gentleman will ask unanimous consent that that instruction be given, I am perfectly willing that it be given to the Committee on Rules. [Applause.]

Mr. BENNET. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. HENRY. I hope my colleague will ask that.

Mr. CANTRILL. Mr. Speaker, I am simply stating what my views are on this proposition. When I conclude my views, and my time has about expired, the chairman of the Committee on Rules can make that request of the House. I am comparatively a new Member of this House.

Mr. BENNET. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. CANTRILL. Just in a second. I have only served in this House eight years. It is not my purpose or intention to undertake to override the will of the leaders of the House on this proposition, but I want this House to understand I do not take any stock in this talk that has been handed across the aisle here in a political way or a partisan way. There is much more involved than that, and I am not going to undertake to criticize the gentleman who offered this resolution. I have my individual views on that proposition, but I think it beneath my dignity as a Member of the House to impugn his motives [applause] and to say what any man's individual opinion should be, or any Member of this House. Here are the facts in this case. I for one speak for this side of the House, and I believe it is a mistake to stop this investigation now. [Applause.] I would never have dignified it in the beginning—I want to be plain about that—never in the beginning; but since having gone into it, when a man comes before the committee and says that he will give this information to another committee, I am going to be fair to both sides of this House, if the Committee on Rules, acting as your agent, not on this side, but of the House, has authority, it should get that information. If this committee has not got this power, then give it the power. What is the use of us going to another committee or offering any other resolution? The House of Representatives can give the Committee on Rules the power now; and if you do give the committee the power, it will bring this man back before the committee. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman's time be extended one minute in order that I may ask a question.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks unanimous consent that the time of the gentleman from Kentucky be extended one minute. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I want the gentleman to let me ask in his time unanimous consent that the Committee on Rules be directed to report to the House the records of the proceedings showing the contumacy of the witness, Thomas W. Lawson, and to report forthwith and to invoke the judgment of the House of Representatives.

Mr. CANTRILL. Now, Mr. Speaker, just a moment in my time. The request I made of the House is this, that this witness, Lawson, be recalled before the committee and that the questions that he failed to answer be submitted to him in writing.

Mr. HENRY. I will put it that way.

Mr. CANTRILL. That those questions be put to him in writing, and if he declines to answer them, then let the Committee on Rules report. [Applause.]

Mr. HENRY. I say I will put it that way. Mr. Speaker, I put the request that way.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, reserving the right to object, if the gentleman will include in that request a rereference of this resolution to the committee it will, of course, be in order, but otherwise the committee can have no power even for a unanimous-consent agreement.

Mr. HENRY. I make that request, too. [Applause.]

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas will state his question again.

Mr. HENRY. I want the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CANTRILL] to hear me.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. CANTRILL] will give heed to the gentleman from Texas.

Mr. HENRY. I ask unanimous consent, then, that this resolution be rereferred to the Committee on Rules, and also that the committee be directed or instructed—

A MEMBER. Authorized.

Mr. HENRY. We have the authority. That it be directed to call before the committee again Thomas W. Lawson and again ask him the questions which he refused to answer, in writing; that those questions be reduced to writing and be again propounded to the witness; and that if he fails or refuses to answer them fully and completely, then the proceedings be reported to the House in order that the Committee on Rules may ask the judgment of the House of Representatives.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas asks—

Mr. LENROOT. I would like to make one suggestion.

Mr. HENRY. Yes.

Mr. LENROOT. Will the gentleman add to that that the committee require said Lawson to answer such questions?

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to make this suggestion to both gentlemen. It is perfectly proper, in my judgment, under the circumstances of these proceedings to rerefer this resolution to the Committee on Rules with instructions to report the resolution back within a limited time, but if you are going to base contempt proceedings or prosecutions for a misdemeanor upon loose talk like this in the record, you will never get very far with that. [Applause.]

Mr. SHERLEY. Mr. Speaker, if the House will permit me, I would like to make a suggestion, because I think there is considerable confusion in the minds of men touching the power of the House to deal with a situation of this kind.

Men talk about contempt proceedings. The proceeding I think that ought to be taken, if you desire to obtain from Mr. Lawson the answers to the questions that he declined to answer, is to see to it that the resolution empowering the Committee on Rules to act is sufficiently broad to make the question or questions pertinent. Then, upon the refusal of Mr. Lawson or any other witness to answer, in my judgment, the House, and probably the committee, could cause such witness to be taken into custody and held until he does answer.

Now, if the House will indulge me a moment further, there is this distinction between that sort of proceeding and what is designated as a contempt proceeding. A contempt proceeding partakes of the nature of punishment, but the other proceeding is what the courts have frequently designated as one where the person imprisoned, holds the keys to his prison, can unlock the doors by doing the thing that he is required to do.

Now, to my mind it is inconceivable that a legislative body has not the inherent power to compel the doing of anything that is necessary to the performance of its proper functions, and on that ground if you will write a proper resolution as to the subject of the inquiry, the Committee on Rules can compel a witness to answer, and, failing that, it probably, or the House certainly, can commit him until he does answer.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, if the gentleman will permit a suggestion, I do not know whether Mr. Lawson took the benefit of the advice of counsel or not. I should have a good deal of doubt about the power of the House to punish Mr. Lawson for contempt, or to require him to testify in answer to the questions that were submitted to him, under the privileged resolution which was referred with instructions to report back in 10 days. And if we are to undertake to compel Mr. Lawson to testify we ought to be fortified where we can require him to testify and not have our proceedings set aside by a court.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, I would like unanimous consent to proceed for three or four minutes.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, if this movement—

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, that does not waive this pending motion?

The SPEAKER. No; the pending motion is to suspend.

Mr. GARRETT. Mr. Speaker, if the action which seems to be in the minds of many gentlemen is to be taken, it occurs to me that it might not be a bad idea for the chairman of the committee to ask unanimous consent that this entire proceeding may be passed over until to-morrow. Now, that will give time within which to report this resolution under the instructions of the House. I want to say that I concur as a lawyer in the ideas that have been expressed by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]. I have not cared to enter into a discussion of those matters so far, because I have not thought that we had reached that question or would reach it at this time.

Gentlemen have come to me day after day while the Committee on Rules has been sitting and undergoing this fearful ordeal which the House imposed upon it, with the suggestion of "Why do you not send him to jail?" When their attention was respectfully called to the fact that there was some doubt as a legal proposition whether it could be done, impatience was indicated, and in some instances Members of the House who approached members of the committee concerning that were almost as insulting as Lawson himself was supposed to be.

Now, I want to say that if this House proposes to instruct the committee on this proposition, and if I am to be charged with any responsibility in connection with the report in that regard, I am extremely anxious that the instructions given by the House shall be very specific and very plain and very full. And I am under the impression that it might not be a bad idea for this matter to be passed over and give to gentlemen who desire to give instructions to the Rules Committee—and I do not want any responsibility in connection with that myself—to give the gentlemen who are desirous of instructing the Rules Committee the opportunity to prepare the instructions that they wish to be given. It is no trifling matter when an undertaking is made by the Congress to send one to prison. Lawson trifled with the House? Of course he did. The House by giving attention to it submitted its committee to his insults. [Applause.] The committee was acting as the agent of the House, and every Member of it felt the humiliation. But when gentlemen come in an effort to criticize the committee because it does not undertake to exercise a power concerning which there is great legal doubt, they should at least remember that some of us have given patient attention and thought to that question, and we hesitate to do it because we do not care to be made ridiculous by a court of the country.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. GARRETT. I will.

Mr. MANN. The gentleman from Tennessee appreciates what is apparently the temper of the House with reference to the matter. Does he not think that the committee having this matter under investigation ought to suggest to the House any needed authority that it might have and ask the House to give it by resolution any authority which it may need which it does not now have? And does the gentleman doubt that the House will do that, as a matter of course, without hesitation?

Mr. GARRETT. If that possibly can be done it would be a very good course to pursue to do it. My suggestion is, however, that if that course is to be taken there are 300 men here, many of them lawyers, all of them men of common sense, but men who on the whole can not be expected to deal with this question in the way it is necessary that it should be dealt with here in this large body at this time.

Mr. MANN. Of course, if the gentleman from Tennessee believes that the Committee on Rules can not define the authority that it needs to make this investigation, I should think we ought to send the matter to the Committee on the Judiciary, which has had experience and which knows how.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, I ask for two minutes.

The SPEAKER. The Chair would inquire of the gentleman—

Mr. GARRETT. Of course, Mr. Speaker, I have not indicated that the Committee on Rules can not report to the House what it thought was the power it needed. I would not like that idea to go abroad by anything that has been said by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]. I have no objection, however, to referring it to the Committee on the Judiciary. I will say that.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, I wish to proceed for two minutes.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, I want to make a unanimous-consent request.

Mr. LENROOT. Let me make my statement first?

Mr. HENRY. All right.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Wisconsin asks to proceed for two minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. LENROOT. Mr. Speaker, I would like to suggest to the chairman that he present his unanimous-consent request in the way that I think will give us a solution of this difficulty. If the gentleman will ask now that this resolution be recommitted to the Committee on Rules I am sure that there will not be the slightest difficulty in the committee unanimously agreeing upon a resolution to be presented to this House, giving it the full authority, and thus remove any possible doubt concerning it.

Mr. HENRY. Mr. Speaker, that is precisely what I rose to do. I ask unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, that this resolution be recommitted to the Committee on Rules; and, pending the submission of that request by the Chair, I will state that the committee will be called to meet to-morrow morning at 10 o'clock to take up these questions.

Mr. FOSTER. Mr. Speaker, may I make a suggestion to the gentleman from Texas?

Mr. CAMPBELL. Mr. Speaker, may I suggest that it might be well to have the time extended?

Mr. FOSTER. Yes; that is what I was getting at. This committee was required to report within 10 days, and those 10 days will expire to-morrow. I suggest to the gentleman that he ask to extend the time for the report to be made to the House.

Mr. HENRY. And that it report within 10 days.

Mr. GLASS rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from Virginia rise?

Mr. GLASS. To ask permission to make an inquiry of the chairman of the Committee on Rules. If it is in order, I would like to ask the chairman of the Committee on Rules what is the status of House resolution 420, which was referred to his committee? I make the inquiry, Mr. Speaker, because in my conception of the case Lawson is by no means the chief offender against the dignity and reputation of this House.

Mr. HENRY. I will answer the gentleman's question. The gentleman evidently did not hear my remarks a moment ago. That resolution is still pending, and the Committee on Rules can take it up at any time.

Now, Mr. Speaker, I renew my request.

The SPEAKER. What about; the time of reporting?

Mr. HENRY. And that the time be extended five days.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Texas [Mr. HENRY] asks unanimous consent that the so-called Wood resolution, No. 429, together with the report thereon, be recommitted to the Committee on Rules, with instructions to report within five legislative days. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none, and it is so ordered.

CHANGE OF REFERENCE (H. DOC. NO. 1796).

The SPEAKER. The Chair has a letter from the chief justice of the Supreme Court of the District of Columbia with reference to certain matters submitted to him. It is in the nature of a claim, and by some inadvertence it was referred to the Committee on the District of Columbia. It ought to be referred to the Committee on Claims. Without objection, the reference will be changed.

Mr. MANN. Well, Mr. Speaker, is that the decree in reference to the Anacostia Flats, which was transmitted some time ago—a decree in reference to the title to certain overflowed lands? I do not think that goes to the Committee on Claims. It might possibly go to the Committee on Appropriations.

The SPEAKER. It is the case of the United States against Littlefield, Alvord & Co. et al.

Mr. MANN. That is not a claim at all. That is a case where the Government is seeking to quiet the title of some lands. In quieting the title under the decree it is provided that certain sums shall be paid for buildings of some sort on the land. It is not a claim against the Government.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, it will be referred to the Committee on Appropriations.

There was no objection.

REGULATION OF IMMIGRATION.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I call up the conference report on the bill (H. R. 10384) to regulate the immigration of aliens to, and the residence of aliens in, the United States.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama calls up the conference report on the immigration bill. The Clerk will report it and read the report.

Mr. BENNET rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from New York rise?

Mr. BENNET. To make a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BENNET. At what stage in the proceedings should a point of order be made against this conference report? My recollection is after the reading of the report and before the reading of the statement.

The SPEAKER. That is correct.

The Clerk read the conference report, as follows:

CONFERENCE REPORT (NO. 1266).

The committee of conference on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the bill H. R. 10384, "An act to regulate the immigration of aliens to, and the residence of aliens in, the United States," having met, after full and free conference have agreed to recommend and do recommend to their respective Houses as follows:

That the Senate recede from its amendments numbered 4, 6, 7, and 35.

That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendments of the Senate numbered 1, 2, 3, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 29, 30, 31, 33, 34, 36, and 37, and agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 5: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 5, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed insert the following: "unless otherwise provided for by existing treaties, persons who are natives of islands not possessed by the United States adjacent to the Continent of Asia, situate south of the twentieth parallel of latitude north, west of the one hundred and sixtieth meridian of longitude east from Greenwich, and north of the tenth parallel of latitude south, or who are natives of any country, Province, or dependency situate on the Continent of Asia west of the one hundred and tenth meridian of longitude east from Greenwich and east of the fiftieth meridian of longitude east from Greenwich and south of the fiftieth parallel of latitude north, except that portion of said territory situate between the fiftieth and the sixty-fourth meridians of longitude east from Greenwich and the twenty-fourth and thirty-eighth parallels of latitude north, and no alien now in any way excluded from, or prevented from entering, the United States shall be admitted to the United States"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 22: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 22, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed to be stricken out insert the following:

"Sec. 11a. That the Secretary of Labor is hereby authorized and directed to enter into negotiations, through the Department of State, with countries vessels of which bring aliens to the United States, with a view to detaining inspectors and matrons of the United States Immigration Service for duty on vessels carrying immigrant or emigrant passengers between foreign ports and ports of the United States. When such inspectors and matrons are detailed for said duty they shall remain in that part of the vessel where immigrant passengers are carried; and it shall be their duty to observe such passengers during the voyage and report to the immigration authorities in charge at the port of landing any information of value in determining the admissibility of such passengers that may have become known to them during the voyage."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 28: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 28, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed insert the following:

"All aliens coming to the United States shall be required to state under oath the purposes for which they come, the length of time they intend to remain in the United States, whether or not they intend to abide in the United States permanently and become citizens thereof, and such other items of information regarding themselves as will aid the immigration officials in determining whether they belong to any of the excluded classes enumerated in section 3 hereof."

And the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 32: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 32, and agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed by the Senate insert the following: "taken up his permanent residence in this country"; and the Senate agree to the same.

Amendment numbered 38: That the House recede from its disagreement to the amendment of the Senate numbered 38, and

agree to the same with an amendment as follows: In lieu of the matter proposed insert the following: "July 1, 1917"; and the Senate agree to the same.

JOHN L. BURNETT,
E. A. HAYES,
Managers on the part of the House.
E. D. SMITH,
THOMAS W. HARDWICK,
H. C. LODGE,
Managers on the part of the Senate.

STATEMENT.

The managers on the part of the House on the disagreeing votes of the two Houses on the amendments of the Senate to the House bill (H. R. 10384), regulating the immigration of aliens, submit the following detailed statement in explanation of the effect agreed upon and recommended in the conference report:

Amendment numbered 1: Amendment numbered 1 provides that the act shall be enforced in the Philippine Islands by officers of the general government thereof unless and until it is superseded by an act passed by the Philippine Legislature as authorized in the Philippine government act. The purpose of this, of course, is to avoid any conflict between this act and the recently passed Philippine government act.

Miscellaneous unimportant amendments: Amendments numbered 2, 3, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 24, 25, 26, 27, 29, 30, 31, 33, 34, 36, and 37, with respect to all of which it is recommended that the House recede from its disagreement and agree to the same, are merely changes perfecting the text by correcting clerical and grammatical errors and errors of punctuation or improving the language without materially changing its effect or bringing different provisions into textual consonance with each other. These, therefore, call for no special comment.

Amendment numbered 4: The effect of amendment numbered 4, with respect to which it is recommended that the Senate recede, would be to exclude aliens whose intention it is to return to the country whence they come, after temporarily engaging in laboring pursuits in the United States, and those who, after having been admitted to the United States, return to the country whence they came, there to reside or for the purpose of taking part in any war in which such country is involved, unless aliens of the said two descriptions were otherwise qualified for admission and came voluntarily from contiguous foreign territory to seek employment in harvesting crops. Although of apparently but slight practical value because its enforcement would necessitate the accurate ascertainment of the intention of the persons thereby affected, it would not have been difficult for the committee of conference to have agreed to the first part of this amendment (to the second there would seem to be additional obvious objections); but on the attention of the committee being directed to the fact that the entire amendment is in conflict with treaties between the United States and certain foreign countries the recommendation that the Senate recede was determined upon. While amendments numbered 23 and 28 were inserted by the Senate largely because of the insertion of this amendment they both seem useful in themselves and, with the change suggested in that numbered 28, unobjectionable.

Amendment numbered 5: Concerning the effect of Senate amendment numbered 5, with respect to which it is recommended that the House recede from its disagreement and agree to the same with amendments, it should be pointed out that two separate and distinct provisions are involved:

(a) The managers on the part of the House agree to so much of this amendment—inserted by the Senate Committee on Immigration—as substitutes for the provision contained in the bill as passed by the House excluding Hindus and persons who can not become eligible for naturalization, a provision excluding aliens who are natives of certain islands and mainland territory of Asia defined by longitudinal and latitudinal lines; but with an amendment to the Senate amendment by which a parallel of latitude is selected to form the northern boundary of the continental territory defined, so that Siberia will be excluded therefrom.

(b) So much of this Senate amendment—inserted on the floor of the Senate—as purports to be a nonrepealing clause could not be agreed to in the form in which proposed because it was found, on carefully considering its relation to other parts of the act, that much inconsistency and confusion would be created thereby. It is sufficient to point out that the matter proposed would render the next succeeding provision of the act incorrect in its reference to "the provision next foregoing,"

and would be in direct conflict with section 38 of the act containing a carefully drawn nonrepealing clause. Therefore the recommendation is made for the insertion, not as a separate provision but as a part of the provision excluding by geographical lines, of words calculated to accomplish the purpose the latter part of the Senate amendment has in view.

Amendment numbered 6: This amendment is closely related to the preceding one. The conclusion to recommend that the Senate recede therefrom was reached because the difficulty intended to be met thereby is solved by the suggested amendment to amendment numbered 5 fixing a northern boundary for the territory geographically defined, taken in conjunction with the exempting provision to which amendment number 6 relates.

Amendment numbered 7: The effect of this amendment, from which it is recommended that the Senate recede, would be to require that aliens who might claim exemption from the operation of the "illiteracy clause" on the ground that they were fleeing from religious persecution should show that the persecution had been such as to deny them the means or opportunity to obtain an education.

Amendments numbered 8 and 9: With respect to both of these amendments the recommendation is that the House recede from its disagreement. The principal effect of amendment numbered 8 and of the latter part of amendment numbered 9 is to remove from the law provisions calculated to encourage aliens to declare for ulterior purposes their intention to become citizens of the United States. The first part of amendment numbered 9 strikes from the bill a provision of a retaliatory nature contained therein when it passed the House, authorizing immigration officials to exclude from the United States, whenever any foreign country contiguous thereto excludes certain classes of United States citizens, similar classes of citizens of such contiguous foreign country.

Amendment numbered 22: By this amendment the Senate proposed to strike from the measure all of section 11a. When the immigration bill H. R. 6060 was under consideration in the Sixty-third Congress, the eleventh section thereof was worded substantially the same as section 11a, inserted in this measure on the floor of the House. But it was found advisable to change section 11 of that bill to read substantially as section 11 of the present measure reads, because objection had been made by certain foreign countries to the detailing of inspectors and matrons of the United States Immigration Service for duty on vessels sailing under the flags of such foreign countries. The effect of the amendment now proposed to the Senate amendment will be to authorize the Secretary of Labor to negotiate with foreign countries with a view to accomplishing the principal objects of section 11a as passed by the House.

Amendments numbered 23 and 28: One of the purposes of these amendments was to give effect to amendment numbered 4, from which, for reasons hereinbefore stated, it was concluded to recommend that the Senate recede. However, as before stated, that recommendation regarding amendment numbered 4 does not destroy the value of these two amendments and requires only a slight change in the latter of them.

Amendment numbered 32: The effect of the recommendation that the House recede from its disagreement to this amendment and agree to the same with the suggested amendment is to permit any alien who, after taking up a permanent residence in this country, sends for his wife or minor child to join him, to have such wife or child, if found on arrival to be afflicted with an easily curable disease, treated in the hospital at the station where examined until cured, or admitted if it is found that admission can occur without danger to other persons.

Amendment numbered 35: The recommendation that the Senate recede from this amendment does not involve any change in the meaning of the act. Section 3 provides for the exclusion of aliens convicted or who admit the commission of crimes involving moral turpitude and also for the exclusion of certain other carefully described classes closely related to the criminal class. But a proviso is attached to said section exempting from exclusion all of those who have been convicted, or who admit the commission, or who teach or advocate the commission of political offenses. The clause to which amendment numbered 35 relates makes it a misdemeanor to assist a member of one of the said excluded classes to enter. Of course no one could be prosecuted for assisting in the entry of one who was within the exempting clause, for such person would have a right to enter.

Amendment numbered 38: The effect of this amendment is to fix the date of the taking effect of the act as July 1, 1917.

JOHN L. BURNETT,
E. A. HAYES,
Managers on the part of the House.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Speaker, I make a point of order against the conference report, on the ground that the conferees exceeded their authority in connection with an amendment to section 38, the amendment being No. 38, found on page 67 of the print of the bill before the House. The situation is this—

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, if there are other points of order to which the gentleman thinks the conference report is subject I hope he will raise them at the present time, because if the Chair should rule out the conference report, it would be a pity to bring it back and each time it is presented have points of order raised against it.

Mr. BENNET. That would be sad, indeed.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, I wish to raise some points of order. Will the Chair have them now?

The SPEAKER. When the gentleman from New York gets through with his point of order, then the Chair will hear any other gentleman.

Mr. BENNET. It is worth while to serve in this Congress to hear the gentleman from Massachusetts raise points of order against a conference report on the immigration bill, and I will not deprive him of that pleasure.

My point of order is this: In line 19, page 67, as the bill passed the House it provided that the act shall take effect after July 1, 1916. When the bill got to the Senate the Senate struck out that date and inserted the words "May 1, 1917." To that in due course the House disagreed. When it got into conference the conferees inserted the date July 1, 1917.

The SPEAKER. Will the gentleman state those three dates again?

Mr. BENNET. The three dates are these: The House date is July 1, 1916; the Senate date is May 1, 1917; the conference date is July 1, 1917.

The present Speaker ruled on this precise point on the 2d day of March, 1915, the point being raised by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] on page 5201 of the Record of March 2, 1915, being sustained by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] in an argument on page 5202, and also by other gentlemen. The Chair sustained the point of order in a brief but luminous decision on page 5208.

The SPEAKER. Now, does the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] desire to interpose any other points of order?

Mr. GARDNER. I desire to raise two other points of order, so that we may have them all determined at once. I do this, not because I wish to delay the consideration of this conference report, but in order to make sure that at some future time these other two points shall not be brought forward to delay us in case the Chair to-day sustains the point of order of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BENNET].

First, I raise the point of order that the conferees have exceeded their authority by inserting in amendment No. 5 the following words:

And no alien now in any way excluded from or prevented from entering the United States shall be admitted to the United States.

I raise the point of order that in inserting those words the conferees have exceeded their powers.

Mr. SABATH. What amendment is that?

Mr. GARDNER. Amendment No. 5.

Mr. BENNET. The words are found on page 2 of the conference report. They are not in the printed bill.

Mr. GARDNER. On amendment No. 22 I raise the further point of order that the matter inserted, giving the Secretary of Labor authority to enter into certain negotiations, was not within the compass of the matters of difference between the two Houses.

Mr. Speaker, I believe both the points of order that I am making are unsound. I believe the Speaker should overrule them, but I wish to be heard on them, so that all these points of order may be decided to-day and not strung along on different days.

The SPEAKER. Well, the gentleman is not saving the Chair any trouble in the premises.

Mr. GARDNER. I shall discuss my points of order from the adverse point of view if the Chair so desires.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not need to hear any argument about it.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, taking the first amendment, No. 5, page 2, of the conference report, it is true that the phrase—

And no alien now in any way excluded from or prevented from entering the United States shall be admitted to the United States—

has been inserted by the conferees. As the bill passed the House it provided for the exclusion of Hindus and persons who can

not become eligible under existing law to become citizens of the United States by naturalization, unless otherwise provided for by existing agreements as to passports or by existing treaties, conventions, or agreements that may hereafter be entered into.

The Senate struck that provision out, and inserted a text in lieu thereof. I desire to call the Speaker's attention to the last four lines of the text inserted, which are as follows:

Nothing in this act shall be construed to repeal any existing law, treaty, or agreement, in so far as such law, treaty, or agreement serves to prohibit or restrict immigration into the United States or any possession thereof.

In other words, the Senate said: "We do not like the wording of this clause excluding Hindus and other persons. We are going to put the matter in another form, which will not be offensive to anybody." So the Senate, among other things, inserted the four lines which I have just read you. In other words, according to the Senate clause all immigration laws now in existence to-day are to be continued in so far as they are restrictive laws, in so far as they exclude anybody from admission into the United States. It is often stated that at present, under what is generally called a gentlemen's agreement, Japanese coolies are excluded from coming to this country. As a matter of fact, these coolies are excluded by law and not by the gentlemen's agreement. The gentlemen's agreement simply carries out the law without friction. By the act of February 20, 1907, it was provided—

That whenever the President shall be satisfied that passports issued by any foreign government to its citizens to go to any country other than the United States or to any insular possession of the United States or to the Canal Zone are being used for the purpose of enabling the holders to come to the continental territory of the United States to the detriment of labor conditions therein, the President may refuse to permit such citizens of the country issuing such passports to enter the continental territory of the United States from such other country or from such insular possessions or from the Canal Zone.

It is under that provision of law that certain coolies are excluded.

On February 24, 1913, President Wilson issued a proclamation, in which he said:

Whereas by the act entitled "An act to regulate the immigration of aliens into the United States," approved February 20, 1907, when the President is satisfied—

And so forth, and so forth—

I hereby order that such alien laborers, skilled or unskilled, be refused permission to enter the continental territory of the United States.

That proclamation the President made under the law, not under the gentleman's agreement.

The SPEAKER. The Chair will suggest to the gentleman that Mr. Wilson was not President in February, 1913.

Mr. GARDNER. I should have said President Taft. Now, Mr. Speaker, the point of order is as follows: There are those who fear—I do not know how much I express their feeling correctly by saying that they "fear"—the effect of this language inserted by the conferees:

And no alien now excluded from or prevented from entering the United States shall be admitted to the United States.

Their point is that that text will exclude certain parties whom neither the House text nor the Senate text would exclude and that therefore the conferees have exceeded their authority.

Now as to the point of order on amendment No. 22. When this bill passed the House it provided that the Secretary of Labor, whenever he saw fit, should order United States surgeons and matrons on board vessels taking aliens away from this country or bringing them into this country. The Senate felt that such a provision gave the Secretary of Labor power which he had no right to exercise outside the confines of the United States. At all events, the Senate struck out this clause which gave to the Secretary of Labor the power to put surgeons and matrons on board immigrant ships.

When the conferees got together they adopted a provision under which the Secretary of Labor is authorized to enter into negotiations through the Department of State with foreign nations for the purpose of arranging matters so that immigrant ships will, in case of necessity, carry American inspectors and matrons. When these agreements are made inspectors and matrons are to be detailed, and so forth and so on. Obviously it is true that there was no mention in either House or Senate text of any negotiations with foreign nations, nevertheless this new provision is a limitation on the power of the Secretary of Labor, and it does not introduce new matter.

On June 13, 1912, the present Speaker made a ruling, which may be found in section 942 of the Manual. In this opinion he lays down certain general principles with regard to the powers of conferees. Speaker CLARK says:

There are two general rules governing conferences. The first is that conferees can not inject into a bill an absolutely new subject—

Obviously the question of matrons and surgeons on board immigrant vessels is not an absolutely new subject, since the House dealt with it originally—and the second is that what they do inject into a bill must be germane.

We now come to the point of order of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BENNET], with regard to the date fixed by the conferees when this bill is to go into effect.

I have not as yet had a spare moment in which to examine narrowly the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD of March 2, 1915. If, however, on that occasion I successfully maintained, under similar circumstances, that the conferees had exceeded their powers, I am afraid that I can not make a very good argument in opposition to my own prior views on the subject. [Laughter.] But there is this to be said. In the case in question the House of Representatives passed a bill carrying for a certain purpose an appropriation of \$100. The Senate inserted an amendment making it \$1,000.

Mr. BENNET. That is not the decision; that is the gentleman's argument.

Mr. GARDNER. This is the argument of the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN]. Will the gentleman from New York state what that precise question was?

Mr. BENNET. The question was this: The House passed a bill in which sections 1, 2, 3, and 4 took effect at a certain time. The Senate amended it and made it two years after the passage of the bill. The matter went to conference, and the conferees struck out two years and inserted three years, and the Chair held, following the very able contention of two gentlemen on the other side of the aisle, that the conferees could not go outside of the dates, that they could not go below one or above the other, and when they extended the time beyond two years they exceeded their powers, and the point of order must be sustained. What the gentleman is stating is the argument that was used at that time.

Mr. GARDNER. You say that the House provided one date for the law to go into effect, and the Senate provided a different date, and the conferees provided a third date more remote than either. When the bill which you cite was sent to conference, had the date fixed by the House or the date fixed by the Senate been already passed?

Mr. BENNET. No.

Mr. GARDNER. But when this immigration bill was committed to the conferees the date for it to take effect as originally provided in the House bill had already gone by. When we sent this bill to conference the House knew that it could not go into effect on July 1, 1916, and yet that was the date specified in the House text. The House knew that fact for the very good reason that July 1, 1916, had long since passed. Consequently, it is clear that the House knowingly sent to conference a bill containing a House provision which was null and void, just as much so as if the date of effectiveness had been left blank. Meanwhile the Senate had proposed that the bill should go into effect on May 1, 1917. The House on the one hand goes into conference with no future date of effectiveness named, and the Senate goes into conference naming the date of May 1, 1917. The conferees decided to make the act effective on July 1, 1917. I submit that this is an entirely different case from that which the gentleman from New York has cited.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Speaker, of course the rule is well settled that conferees have no authority to inject new matter into a bill, and they have no authority, as a general rule, to go below or above the amount named in the original text or in the amendment or beyond the date named in the original text or amendment where that constitutes the essence of the bill. The case cited by the gentleman from New York was the shipping bill, where it was of the very essence of the bill whether it should take effect at once or in two years or in three years or some further time. Everyone knows as a matter of convenience in the transaction of public business that it is essential in bills of this character that a date in the near future be fixed for bills to take effect. That is not the essence of the law at all; it is more a matter of convenience.

Now, this bill—I do not remember when it was introduced, but I suppose it was introduced at an early day and passed the House April 8, 1916. At that time it provided that it should take effect July 1, 1916, about three months ahead. It passed the Senate on December 14, and as amended by the Senate provided that it should take effect on May 1, about three months ahead, a convenient time for the preparation of the enforcement of the law. That is not of the essence of the law at all. That does not constitute one of the features of the law. That is more a matter of convenience in the administration of the law and preparing for its administration. The conferees pro-

vided that it should take effect on July 1, a reasonable time ahead.

Suppose that the Senate had said that the law shall take effect on January 1, it having passed the Senate on December 14. Would it not be rather foolish to say that nobody had the power to change the date when the law takes effect, if it does not take effect until after January? Yet that is the position we would be left in if the contention of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BENNET] should prevail. I think that a little common sense injected into parliamentary law is always valuable. It always has seemed to me that propositions of parliamentary law were based upon logic, following out one step after another; and following out in that way, I think the conferees had the power to change this date when this act should take effect, it not being the essence of the act at all; and while I think there are probably no decisions upon that subject I believe it would be wise for the Speaker to make one and hold that the point of order is not well taken.

Mr. BENNET rose.

The SPEAKER. Does the gentleman from New York desire to be heard simply upon the point that he raised himself?

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Speaker, I would like to be heard on one of the points raised by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER], and if the Chair has any doubt about the point I raised myself, I would like to be heard upon that. First, upon one of the points raised by the gentleman from Massachusetts. I think that parliamentary law ought to be treated seriously, and with that in view, when I came back to Congress I read and was enlightened by every decision which the present occupant of the chair has made since he came into the chair, and I find that he takes parliamentary law seriously. I am not accusing the gentleman from Massachusetts of not taking parliamentary law seriously. I want to concede at once that one of his points of order, as to which he did me the honor of making me the object of suspicion that I might raise it, is unsound, and that is the point of order that amendment No. 22 as it came from the conference violated the powers of the conferees. It does not. The conferees, I regret to say, clearly had that power, because, as the Chair has ruled three or four times in the last three Congresses, it is the subject matter that governs, and the subject matter there was the placing of immigrant inspectors and matrons on steamers, and where the House put them on definitely and the Senate struck the whole thing out the conferees unquestionably had the right to empower the Secretary to make an investigation. I do not think there is any question about that.

As to amendment No. 5, I think the gentleman from Massachusetts, purely by accident, has made a point of order that is perfectly good. Let us see what this thing is that the Senate put in. What the Senate put in is this:

Nothing in this act shall be construed to repeal any existing law, treaty, or agreement in so far as such law, treaty, or agreement serves to prohibit or restrict immigration into the United States or any possession thereof.

That is what might be called a safety provision, that if by accident they had put anything in this act which could be construed to repeal any existing law, treaty, or agreement, in so far as such law, treaty, or agreement serves to prohibit immigration into the United States or any possession thereof, that it should not have been done. That is rather clumsy legislation, but, nevertheless, the Senate put it there. The conferees adopted another form of English, covering an entirely different subject. Omitting all reference to anything in the act, they made a complete, substantive provision which would be a complete statute if it stood by itself. They omitted that language entirely and inserted a new substantive provision, as follows:

No alien now in any way excluded from or prevented from entering the United States shall be admitted to the United States.

I call the attention of the Chair at the threshold to the fact that the language that I have read would, standing by itself, be a complete law, while the language stricken out in the bill—

Nothing in this act shall be construed to repeal any existing law, treaty, or agreement in so far as such law, treaty, or agreement serves to prohibit or restrict immigration to the United States or any possession thereof—

is a limitation on another act. They are as far apart as the antipodes, as the North and the South Poles.

The SPEAKER. How are they dissimilar? Does not the language of the Senate and the language of the conference report come to the same thing in the end?

Mr. BENNET. No. I shall demonstrate that to the Chair by some documents issued by the Bureau of Labor. I hold in my hand immigration bulletin for November, 1916, in which is contained a list, Table No. 7, of the persons excluded from this country from July, 1916, to November, 1916, under existing

law. This language that has been put in here provides, getting it down to a particular man, that no alien—that is, none of these eleven or twelve thousand aliens—now in any way excluded from or prevented from entering the United States shall be admitted to the United States. It makes them outcasts and pariahs, so far as the United States Government is concerned, forever. The law as put in by the Senate does nothing of the sort. It simply provides that nothing in the whole bill shall be construed to repeal any existing law, treaty, or agreement, in so far as such law, treaty, or agreement serves to prohibit or restrict immigration into the United States or any possession thereof. One operates on a statute and the other operates on a person.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman permit me to ask him a question?

Mr. BENNET. In a moment. If there was not any difference, why the change in language? If the Chair wants a reason why they made the change in language, on page 8 of the same bill as it passed the Senate we find this language:

The provision next foregoing, however, shall not apply to white persons.

So they did not need any provision in there keeping out persons; all they wanted to guard against was any change in the law. When the bill went to conference the conferees disagreed about that provision which let in white persons, and so as to make their own law apply only to Japanese and persons who had been excluded they dropped all reference to statutes and used this very apposite language to keep out the Japanese and other excluded persons:

No alien now in any way excluded from or prevented from entering the United States shall be admitted to the United States.

The provisions are absolutely different. I now yield to the gentleman from Massachusetts.

Mr. GARDNER. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman state a single class of immigrants that is excluded by the wording of the conference phrase that is not excluded by the wording of the Senate phrase?

Mr. BENNET. Yes; I will. A person who comes to this country charged with being liable to become a public charge and is excluded for that reason can go back abroad and at the expiration of a year he can come again, and he is not excluded if at that time he is not liable to become a public charge. A person who comes to this country suffering from a contagious disease and is excluded for that reason can and does, as the records of the Immigration Bureau will bear out, go back to the country from which he came, is treated for the disease, recovers from it, and comes again to this country. There are two cases. Every alien who sailed out of New York Harbor to-day or yesterday, or who sails to-morrow, excluded under existing law because he is liable to become a public charge or afflicted with a contagious disease, if this law is adopted is forever excluded. We all know why this language is here. It has been brought out there is a desire on the part of certain persons in this country that the number of Japanese in this country should not be enlarged. Now, the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] detailed the history of the existing statute under which the Japanese people do not come to this country, and I want to say the fact they do not come in in a larger measure than they do is a source of high credit to the faith-keeping pledges of the Japanese Nation. This provision is very cleverly worded so as to put the forbidding clause against persons: "No alien now in any way excluded from"—that is the "gentleman's agreement" the gentleman from Massachusetts cited—"no alien now in any way excluded from or prevented from entering the United States shall be admitted to the United States"; and so it is a provision against persons absolutely and not merely a limitation upon a legislative provision. The act says:

Nothing in this act shall be construed to repeal any existing law, treaty, or agreement in so far as such law, treaty, or agreement serves to prohibit or restrict immigration into the United States or any possession thereof.

Mr. GARDNER. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BENNET. I will.

Mr. GARDNER. The gentleman says that if a diseased alien comes to this country and is excluded under the present law he goes back abroad and recovers and is entitled to admission he can come again. The gentleman is an able lawyer and we will suppose that this law passes as it comes from the conference committee. Does the gentleman think that the Commissioner of Immigration will put any such construction on that clause as would exclude a healthy laborer merely because at some prior attempt to gain admission to this country he had been suffering from a contagious disease?

Mr. BENNET. It would depend upon how good a lawyer that Commissioner General was.

Mr. GARDNER. Suppose he is as good a lawyer as the gentleman?

Mr. BENNET. If he is as good as I am, he will do what I say.

Mr. HAYES. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNET. I yield to the gentleman.

Mr. HAYES. I want to ask the gentleman if he has read the statute and does not know this statute, if it becomes a law, provides in the case the gentleman mentions that this man would not be excluded at all?

Mr. BENNET. My friend from California—

Mr. HAYES. The law permits, in another place, such persons of both classes to which the gentleman refers to make application to the immigration authorities and permits their admission. Now, no lawyer or administrator of law is going to construe one part of a statute, which is plainly not intended to reach that at all and does not with any sort of reasonable construction, to nullify another positive provision of the statute.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Speaker, my friend from California was a good lawyer before—

Mr. HAYES. I do not claim to be a good lawyer like the gentleman from New York, but I do claim to have a little sense in matters of this kind—horse sense.

Mr. BENNET. I started to say the gentleman from California was a good lawyer before he started in on his present highly successful business and legislative career. I do not even say he has ceased to be a good lawyer, but the gentleman is somewhat biased by locality. There is a prejudice against—I will not say that—I will stop there. I do not think the people of California are highly anxious to have the Japanese people come in, and I think the gentleman from California always well represents his people. He can take that as a compliment or a criticism, as he pleases. But anyone who studies this language must say that if the two things mean the same thing, why do they change the language, and can it possibly be contended that the language of the bill as inserted by the Senate, which is the commonest sort of limitation applying to the laws and legislation, can be taken to be an equivalent of the language of the conference report, which, by the use of well-chosen words of the briefest kind, applies grimly and decisively to persons and to persons only? The gentleman says language in the other parts of the bill will let these people in, anyway. That is rather a hard criticism on the bill if you let in people in one part of the bill and keep them out in another. I think the construction of the statute, although I do not stake my reputation as a lawyer on this, is that the court would be very apt to give effect to that part of the law that was last placed in the statute as disclosed by the journals of the two Houses. I think that is a fairly reasonable construction.

Mr. Speaker, I have concluded. I know the point of order I made is well taken. If it were worth while to argue it the gentleman from Illinois is answered by the Chair. The argument of the gentleman from Illinois is in a supposititious case that this Congress might not be able to act except by a concurrent resolution.

That is what the Chair said a prior Congress was driven to by law. The Chair said:

Unless the memory of the Chair is badly out of condition, this thing happened when the Payne bill was passed: There were certain amendments in controversy. The House fixed the rate on shoes, and so forth, at 15 per cent, and the Senate fixed it at 20 per cent. I have heard—I do not know that it is true, but from what happened afterwards I believe it to be true—that President Taft notified the conferees that if they did not cut that rate on boots and shoes to 10 per cent he would not sign the bill. I know that the House passed a resolution in order to enable the conferees to cut the rate down to 10.

As far as the suggestion made by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CHISEL] is concerned, that where everything after the enacting clause is struck out, then the conferees have carte blanche to bring in a bill; but that is not this case here. The House never did strike out everything after the enacting clause in the Weeks bill. It practically agreed to the Weeks bill, which has really been in conference only technically. But the limit of time was fixed at two years, and the conferees extended it to three years. If they could extend it beyond two years, they could extend it until the end of time. Their limit was from zero to two. In the nature of things they could not go below zero; under the practice of the two Houses they could not go higher.

Furthermore, the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] says this change in date is not a matter of substance. The facts of the bill have escaped the recollection of the gentleman from Illinois, evidently. This bill raises the head tax on aliens from \$4 to \$8. This change in the conference puts the time when the bill goes into effect back two months beyond the further date, that placed by the Senate. At the same time in those two months there has come into this country, and those are good months, May and June—

Mr. HAYES. The gentleman does not want to make a misstatement. The conferees extended the time two months. They gave two months more time.

Mr. BENNET. They gave two months more time to the \$4 men. And, as I was about to say, assuming in those two months, May and June, there should come into this country 50,000 aliens, the conferees' change would cost the Treasury of the United States \$200,000. If there was only one alien to come in, it would cost the Treasury \$4. Now, \$200,000 may not be a matter of substance. It is to me; it may not be to other gentlemen. At any rate, I submit it is not within the province of the Chair, and I submit it respectfully, and the Chair will agree with me, to pass on the weight of the different portions of the bill. The Chair is empowered to pass on the question of whether the conferees inserted in the bill language which they were not given the power to insert in the bill. And on this almost precise point the Chair ruled and sustained a point of order which was almost exactly similar, under almost precisely the same conditions as that raised by me. Now, in concluding, I think the point raised by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] as to amendment No. 5 is a well-raised point, and I know that the point that is raised by myself in connection with amendment No. 38 is well raised.

Mr. KENT. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNET. Yes.

Mr. HAYES. Mr. Speaker, unless the Chair does not desire it, I would like to address a few words to the point of order raised by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER] on amendment No. 5. I think I am making no improper statement when I say that the conferees did not insert the language which has been objected to in the place of the language to be found in lines 18 to 21, page 8, of the bill. The language inserted by the conferees, which has been read, was inserted in place of a part of the House provision which was stricken from the bill by the Senate, at the bottom of page 7 and at the top of page 8:

Hindus and persons who can not become eligible, under existing law, to become citizens of the United States by naturalization, unless otherwise provided for by existing agreements as to passports, or by existing treaties, conventions, or agreements, or by treaties, conventions, or agreements that may be hereafter entered into.

As I have said, that language the Senate has stricken from the bill, and the conferees inserted in place of part of it the following:

And no alien now in any way excluded from or prevented from entering the United States shall be admitted to the United States.

The purpose and the effect of the House language was to exclude all orientals. Those are the only aliens that could possibly be operated upon by that provision. Now, the Senate struck this out and incorporated a geographical exclusion provision, which excluded all Asiatic people excepting only the coolies of Japan, and left the laboring people of Japan to be excluded by the gentlemen's agreement now in force between this country and Japan. The House conferees objected to leaving that possible avenue of immigration open in case the gentlemen's agreement should for any reason be annulled, either by the agreement of the parties, or by the act of one party, or by lapse of time; therefore we added to the language of the Senate making the geographical exclusion the words that I last read, in order to provide for exclusion in case the agreement now in force between the two nations should for any reason come to an end.

The language of the House, if the Speaker will notice, would exclude all Asiatics except those who are excluded by agreement or by treaty, and the language is so worded that if the treaty should for any reason be annulled or come to an end, immediately the language of the House bill would become effective and exclude under the law; and the language which was inserted by the conferees has precisely the same result, and no other.

The language used by the conferees is supposed to be less objectionable to those proposed to be excluded, but does not affect any class of aliens not affected by the House bill. It is therefore clearly not subject to the point of order.

The SPEAKER. The Chair is ready to rule on all three of these points. He overrules both points made by the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER].

Now, on this other point, about this trouble as to time, it is unnecessary for the Chair to state that he dislikes exceedingly to knock a conference report out on a point of order, especially a conference report that involves great and interesting subjects. But it seems to the Chair that it is better to have a rule and stick to it than to have a variety of decisions about the very same point involved.

This case on the question of time is almost exactly on all fours with the decision the present incumbent of the chair rendered on the shipping bill. That was a question about time. That was a very important subject, too, and so is this one.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, will the Chair hear me for a moment there?

The SPEAKER. Yes.

Mr. BURNETT. That was an impossibility—the date fixed by the House and the time fixed by the conference. Therefore, it seems to me, as suggested by the gentleman from Illinois, that it is not a question of going between the lowest date and the highest date, because there is a date that does not exist. It is an impossible date with reference to the time the Senate acted upon it, and it does not fall within the rule under the decision of the Chair previously.

The SPEAKER. If any date had not been named, of course everybody knows the bill would go into effect on the day it is signed by the President.

Now, as to the shipping bill, the Chair had on his side the luminous opinion of both the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MANN] and the gentleman from Massachusetts [Mr. GARDNER]. That was a well-considered opinion, and the Chair does not think he can improve on it, so he will read it. In this case the House fixed this date of July 1, 1916. The Senate fixed it at May 1, 1917. The conferees fix the date as July 1, 1917.

Well, it may be true, as the gentleman from Illinois states, that it is a sort of immaterial matter; but you can not have a ruling one way because the Chair or somebody else thinks the matter is immaterial and have it the other way when you think it is important. I agree with the gentleman thoroughly that there ought to be common sense injected into parliamentary law, as in everything else.

Now, on that shipping bill there were three points made against it, but there is no use to read about the two. But on the third point there was this same identical question of time, so in rendering that decision I said:

He—

That is, the Chair—

overrules the second proposition about American citizenship in section 9. He thinks that is a limitation. He sustains the point of order as to time.

And he gives these reasons:

If there is anything settled about conferences between the two Houses it is this: Where two amounts are named and the question is referred to the conferees they may oscillate as much as they please between the two extremes, but they can not go below the lower amount and they can not go above the higher amount. That applies to sums of money in appropriation bills. This has been ruled so often that it is as familiar as the multiplication table. In tariff bills, where the one House suggests one rate on any given article and the other House suggests another rate the conferees can not go below the lower and they can not go above the higher rate.

Now, everybody will admit that it is a simple regulation as to a tariff bill. If that were not true, the conferees can go out and actually make a new tariff bill.

Unless the memory of the Chair is badly out of condition, this thing happened when the Payne bill was passed: There were certain amendments in controversy. The House fixed the rate on shoes, and so forth, at 15 per cent, and the Senate fixed it at 20 per cent. I have heard—I do not know that it is true, but from what happened afterwards I believe it to be true—that President Taft notified the conferees that if they did not cut out that rate on boots and shoes to 10 per cent he would not sign the bill. I know that the House passed a joint resolution in order to enable the conferees to cut the rate down to 10.

As far as the suggestion made by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. CHAPIN] is concerned, that where everything after the enacting clause is struck out then the conferees have carte blanche to bring in a bill, that is not the case here.

It is not the case now.

The House never did strike out everything after the enacting clause in the Weeks bill.

There is no use to read the rest of it. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the bill be sent back to the committee of conference. I move that we disagree to the amendments of the Senate and ask for a further conference.

Mr. BENNET rose.

The SPEAKER. For what purpose does the gentleman from New York rise?

Mr. BENNET. To call the attention of the Speaker to the fact that the House having disagreed to the conference report—because under the decisions the sustaining of a point of order is the same as disagreeing—under section 6396 of the fifth volume of Hinds' Precedents the right to make a motion passes to the opposition; and I desire the floor for the purpose of making a preferential motion.

The SPEAKER. The Chair does not think that applies to the point of order. This morning, on that other matter that we had up here, if they had voted on that resolution to table the resolution and the motion had been defeated, then unquestionably the control of that resolution would have passed to the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. CAMPBELL]. But that was a different sort of thing.

The Chair recognizes the gentleman from Alabama.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House further disagree to the Senate amendments and ask for a further conference.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Speaker, I desire to be recognized for the purpose of making a preferential motion.

Mr. SABATH. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. SABATH. Would not a motion to postpone the consideration to a certain day be in order?

Mr. MANN. The gentleman should move the previous question.

Mr. SABATH. I move the previous question on the motion to ask for a further conference and disagree to the Senate amendments.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama moves to insist upon the disagreements of the House to the Senate amendments and ask for a conference.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Speaker, a parliamentary inquiry.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman will state it.

Mr. BENNET. Is it proper, when a Member of the House is on his feet to make a preferential motion, to take him off his feet to permit another Member of the House to move the previous question on a motion of lesser degree? I notified the Chair that I desired the floor to make a preferential motion.

The SPEAKER. If the gentleman will state his preferential motion, the Chair would have some idea of what should be done.

Mr. BENNET. I will do that. I move that the House agree to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6. That motion takes precedence over the motion to disagree, because it tends to bring the two Houses together.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I make the point of order that that is not preferential over a motion to disagree and ask a further conference.

Mr. BENNET. Oh, yes; it is.

The SPEAKER. Yes; it is.

Mr. BURNETT. But I had moved the previous question on my motion.

Mr. MANN. The previous question would not cut out a preferential motion.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York will state his motion again.

Mr. BENNET. I move to agree to the amendment of the Senate numbered 6, which reads as follows:

White persons nor to.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from New York makes a preferential motion to agree to Senate amendment numbered 6, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment 6. Page 7, line 11, after the word "to," insert "white persons nor to."

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, I move the previous question on that motion.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from New York [Mr. BENNET] to agree to Senate amendment numbered 6.

Mr. BENNET. I ask unanimous consent that it may be again reported.

The SPEAKER. Without objection, the Clerk will report it again.

The amendment was again read.

The SPEAKER. The question is on agreeing to the amendment.

The motion was rejected.

Mr. BURNETT. Mr. Speaker, now I move the previous question on my motion to disagree and ask a further conference.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Alabama moves the previous question on his motion to further disagree to all the Senate amendments and ask for a further conference.

The previous question was ordered.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the motion of the gentleman from Alabama to disagree and ask for a further conference.

The motion was agreed to, and the Speaker appointed as conferees on the part of the House Mr. BURNETT, Mr. SABATH, and Mr. HAYES.

COMMITTEE ON THE TERRITORIES.

Mr. HOUSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that the Committee on the Territories may have leave to sit during the sessions of the House.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Tennessee asks unanimous consent that the Committee on the Territories have leave to sit during the sessions of the House. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

PENSIONS.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (H. R. 19937) granting pensions and increase of pensions to certain soldiers and sailors of the Civil War and certain widows and dependent children of soldiers and sailors of said war, and I ask unanimous consent that the bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole.

The SPEAKER. The Clerk will report the title of the bill.

The Clerk read the title of the bill.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. ADAIR] asks unanimous consent that this bill be considered in the House as in Committee of the Whole. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The bill is as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Secretary of the Interior be, and he is hereby, authorized and directed to place on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws—

The name of Rachel A. Dougherty, former widow of George F. Dougherty, late of Company C, Thirtieth Regiment Missouri State Militia Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of John I. Israel, late of Company K, Thirty-ninth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph M. Ford, late of Company M, First Regiment Alabama Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Frank M. Douglass, late of Tenth Battery, Indiana Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Tillie C. Wood, widow of John D. Wood, late of Company E, One hundred and forty-fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Mary E. Ryan, helpless and dependent child of Daniel Ryan, late of Company M, Second Regiment Massachusetts Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Samuel Frankenberg, late of Company D, First Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Zachariah Stephens, late of Company E, Fifth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Hanbill Combs, late of Company D, One hundred and eighty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph Dyer, late of Company D, Forty-fifth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas A. Burton, alias Thornton A. Burton, late of Company E, Eleventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John C. Steele, late of Company A, First Regiment, Maine Volunteer Cavalry, and Company C, Thirtieth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Cordelia Briggs, widow of Ansel S. Briggs, late of Company F, Thirty-third Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Jephtha Litteral, late of Company H, Fifty-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles W. Bullard, late of Company H, Twentieth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Matilda A. Miller, widow of Rufus Miller, late of Company M, Third Regiment Rhode Island Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Eliza P. Hanger, late of Company I, One hundred and forty-third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry Wolf, late of Company B, Twenty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Pierpoint, late of Company H, Ninety-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of M. Ellen T. Harris, widow of Joseph B. Harris, late of Company D, Twenty-sixth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Lyman O. Leach, late of Company C, Third Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary Hurd, widow of William A. Hurd, late of Company E, Fifteenth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Jennie D. Bigelow, widow of Jefferson C. Bigelow, late of Company C, and major Fifteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of John D. Vine, late of Company F, Fourth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William D. Smith, late of Company I, Twelfth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Marshall C. Conroe, late of Company M, Fourth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alexander Swisher, late of Company I, One hundred and forty-seventh Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John F. Michael, late of Company C, One hundred and eighty-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William B. King, late of Company H, Two hundred and eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Frank Lauderback, late of Company A, One hundred and seventy-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Cyrus Trough, late of Company C, Sixth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William H. Clouser, late of Company I, Eighty-fourth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Derf, late of Company G, Two hundred and second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Amos E. Evans, late of Company F, Forty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Angelcernelles Wetherby, widow of James Wetherby, late of Company G, Ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Leander McGrew, late of Company B, Thirty-third Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Clem B. I. Ambler, late of Company C, Thirty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry W. Wise, late of Company C, Ninety-ninth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George W. McCurdy, late of Company D, Seventy-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alva French, late of Company C, One hundred and eightieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Robert Daulton, late of Company K, Seventh Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Cyrenous Dalley, late of Company C, Twelfth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John C. Lloyd, late of Company B, Fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Reserve Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Jeffers, late of Company A, Sixteenth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Sarah M. Chandler, widow of George P. Chandler, late of Company E, Second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Reserve Infantry, Companies B and F, One hundred and ninety-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and Company D, Eighteenth United States Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Francis Prater, late of Company I, Forty-seventh Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edward P. Payne, late of Company K, Forty-eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James T. Wilson, late of Company C, First Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Hiram F. Butler, late of Company A, Sixty-fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James H. Campbell, late of Company F, Thirty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James W. Allen, late of Company H, Fifteenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary E. Wrigley, widow of James Wrigley, late of Company G, Twenty-seventh Regiment, and Company K, One hundred and seventy-eighth Regiment, Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Thomas M. Patton, late of Company C, Fifty-fourth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas Hanway, late of Company I, Twenty-sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ira A. Goodridge, late of Company G, Fifty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Huldah Melissa Fleming, widow of Francis E. Fleming, late of Company G, Second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$32 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of David C. Fleming, helpless and dependent child of said Francis E. Fleming, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine; *And provided further*, That in the event of the death of Huldah Melissa Fleming, the name of said David C. Fleming shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$12 per month from and after the date of death of said Huldah Melissa Fleming.

The name of Aaron M. Van Sickle, late of Company I, One hundred and thirty-sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lucinda Gardner, widow of John H. Gardner, late of Company B, Fifteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Robert B. Tozer, late of Company D, One hundred and eighty-eighth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Albert Platt, late of Company E, One hundred and seventy-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas B. McClane, late of Company D, Eighteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$21 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of David Gilchrist, late of Company B, Thirty-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John W. Fultz, late of Company D, Twenty-second Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Collingwood Boulter, late of Company E, First Regiment Colorado Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lena Hilker, helpless and dependent child of Frederick Hilker, late of Company D, Twenty-fourth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Stephen F. Cassaday, late of Company C, Fifty-second Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jesse Price, late of Company G, Tenth Regiment United States Colored Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Andrew Glenn, late of Company B, One hundred and twenty-sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph E. Stafford, late of Company D, Seventh Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Emaline Catherine Lindner, helpless and dependent child of Samuel Lindner, late of Company D, Fifty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of William H. Banks, late a hospital steward, United States Army, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry C. Brown, late of Company B, Fifteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas Phillips, late of Company G, One hundred and tenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles Van Auker, late of Company E, One hundred and fifty-third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George W. Flesher, late of Company B, One hundred and thirty-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Josiah Shemmaker, late of Company E, Thirtieth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Otto G. Hauschildt, late of Company E, Twentieth Regiment New York State Militia Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George Huffman, late of Company C, Fifty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Huey, late of Company B, One hundred and eighty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Benjamin U. Earhart, helpless and dependent child of Francis M. Earhart, late of Company E, One hundred and seventy-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Henriette L. Eggert, former widow of William Lehman, late of Company F, Eighth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Owen B. Vaughn, late of Company H, Ninety-fifth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles E. Case, late of Company A, One hundred and tenth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph Nichols, late of Company F, Seventeenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lewis Leib, late of Company F, Forty-ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Otway C. Chase, late of Company D, One hundred and twenty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John A. Neff, late of Company G, One hundred and seventy-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mordecai M. Duke, late of Company D, Forty-sixth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William H. Williams, late of Company H, Thirty-ninth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Marshall Fernald, late of Company E, Tenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of David Johnson, late of Company D, Eleventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Readding Everitt, late of Company B, One hundred and eleventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Aaron Ready, late of Company D, Fourth Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George Lee, late of Company A, Second Regiment North Carolina Volunteer Mounted Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles W. Smith, late of Company H, First Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Stephen A. West, late a landsman, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John H. Punshon, late of Company F, Fourteenth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Rose Reindl, helpless and dependent child of Wenzel Reindl, late of Company D, Thirteenth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Hollingsworth Gipe, late of Company C, First Regiment Maryland Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph Lucas, late of Companies E and F, Second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Benjamin F. Fry, late of Company E, Forty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and Company I, Mississippi Volunteer Marine Brigade, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Margaret O'Leary, widow of John O'Leary, late of Company E, Twelfth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of William Welsh, late of Company B, Fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$21 per month.

The name of Ludlow B. Ward, late of Company K, Seventh Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George H. Ross, late of Company A, Third Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry J. Knapp, late of Company H, Twenty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Benjamin F. Storer, late of Company A, Sixty-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jacob Booth, late of Company B, One hundred and thirty-fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William C. Douglas, late of Company E, Thirty-fourth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alonzo Pendland, late unassigned, Thirty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George W. Wolfgang, late of Company D, Forty-eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Curtis C. Griffin, late of Company G, Sixty-third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph B. Hanawalt, late of Company C, One hundred and forty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James R. Collins, late of Company F, Third Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry W. Redman, late of Company D, Seventh Regiment Missouri State Militia Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William W. Prather, late quartermaster sergeant Ninety-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Petra G. Cordova, widow of Senobio Cordova, late of Graydon's Independent Company, New Mexico Mounted Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Charles O. Manley, late of Fifth Independent Battery, Illinois Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles S. Hubbard, late of Company K, Third Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Donnelly, late of Company C, Twenty-eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Daniel O. Root, late of Company H, Twenty-fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Philip McKinney, late of Company B, One hundred and sixty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elliott M. Lydick, late of Signal Corps, United States Army, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alpheus P. Gray, late of Company B, Eighty-first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George Lloyd, late of Company F, One hundred and thirty-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George G. Sherlock, late of Company I, Fourth Regiment, and Company I, Twelfth Regiment, Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Philip H. Sipe, late of Company K, Twentieth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Amos Potter, late of Company C, Ninety-fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles E. Bradish, late of Company C, Third Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lewis H. Lake, late of Company I, Sixteenth Regiment New York Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Robert J. Bingham, late of Company F, One hundred and eighty-fourth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Franklin D. Russell, late of Company M, Second Regiment New York Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Dolson, late of Company C, Twenty-ninth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Critchfield, late of Company A, Seventy-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Cornelius McCafferty, late of Company D, Second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles Robinson, late of Company D, Second Regiment Pennsylvania Provisional Cavalry, and Companies B and M, First Battalion Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Virgil A. Phillips, late of Company A, Sixty-fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph L. True, late of Company H, Twenty-second Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Houston Lemon, late of Company I, One hundred and fifty-fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Nay, late of Company E, Sixth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph Wardle, late of Company G, Forty-fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Saint Claire Fechner, late of Company K, Fifth Regiment, and Company E, Ninth Regiment, Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samuel Huddleston, late of Company C, Eighty-fourth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Frederick Brunner, late of Company E, Ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edward N. Webb, late of Troop F, Sixth Regiment United States Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Christopher Dehlen, late of Company D, Second Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$21 per month.

The name of Elbridge Diltz, late of Company M, Fifth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles F. Walters, late of Company B, Forty-fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Annie M. France, helpless and dependent child of William France, late of Company F, One hundred and fourteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of James A. Thompson, late of Company K, Twenty-first Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elmer S. Battin, late of Company K, Forty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry O. Nickerson, late of Company M, Second Regiment Maine Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samuel E. Edmundson, late of Company C, Forty-sixth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lewis W. Mills, late of Company H, Eleventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James Livingstone, late of Company F, Twenty-fifth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Robert R. C. Grantham, late of United States Signal Corps, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas Larkin, late of Company F, Seventieth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Rowland S. True, late a landsman, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Azor M. Nixon, late of Company B, Eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Laura S. Pritchard, widow of John E. Pritchard, late of Company G, One hundred and third Regiment, Company I, Seventy-eighth Regiment, Company D, One hundred and fifty-first Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of John C. Young, late of Company G, Forty-first Regiment, and Company K, Forty-third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William C. Barnett, late of Company H, Thirty-ninth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William R. Smith, late of Company C, Twelfth Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Harmon Blackburn, late of Company F, Seventy-seventh Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John T. Wallin, late of Company I, Seventh Regiment, and Company C, Forty-seventh Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samuel Shoup, late of Company K, One hundred and second Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William H. Cullens, late of Company F, Ninety-second Regiment, and Company G, Sixty-fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Andrew Kerr, late of Company B, One hundred and ninety-third Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Belle P. Wolfe, widow of William J. Wolfe, late of Eighteenth Battery, Indiana Light Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of David M. Crow, late of Company D, Fifty-second Regiment Kentucky Mounted Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ledyard E. Benton, late of Company A, Twelfth Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Melissa Ann Lett, widow of Daniel Lett, late of Company C, Fifth Regiment United States Colored Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Morris W. Hackman, late of Company G, Twenty-ninth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James A. Shequin, late of Company A, Sixth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of J. Harrison Rennard, late of Company K, One hundred and twenty-fourth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Delight A. Allen, widow of Augustus M. Allen, late of Company G, Two hundred and tenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$32 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Burt Allen, helpless and dependent child of said Augustus M. Allen, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *And provided further*, That in the event of the death of Delight A. Allen, the name of Burt Allen shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$12 per month from and after the date of death of said Delight A. Allen.

The name of George R. Peacock, late of Company F, Ninth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George H. Cheek, late of Company D, Second Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Isalah E. Lawrence, late of Company E, One hundred and sixty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James Curtis, late of Battery C, Third United States Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Conkle, late of Company I, Seventieth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Hattie A. McGuire, widow of George F. McGuire, late of Company I, Fifty-seventh Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Alethea L. Sands, widow of Charles J. Sands, late of Company G, Thirteenth Regiment, and Company M, Sixth Regiment New York Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Margaret McEvoy, widow of William McEvoy, late of Company D, Permanent Party, General Service Recruits, United States Army, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of William H. Brown, late of Company G, Fifty-second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Daniel Culver, late of Fifth Battery and Seventh Battery, Indiana Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John N. Kirkendall, late of Company G, One hundred and twenty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary E. Filippo, widow of George J. Filippo, late of Company F, Twelfth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$32 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Bennett A. Filippo, helpless and dependent child of said George J. Filippo, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *And provided further*, That in the event of the death of Mary E. Filippo, the name of said Bennett A. Filippo shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$12 per month from and after the death of said Mary E. Filippo.

The name of John Cragan, late of Company F, Thirty-seventh Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lucy W. Lockwood, widow of George M. Lockwood, late of Company F, Thirty-third Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of Martin Cade, late of Company E, Fifty-first Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John F. Scofield, late of Company I, Seventy-third Regiment, and Company B, Twenty-ninth Regiment, Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of David Freid, late of Company B, Twenty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Francis R. Culp, late of Company K, Seventy-sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William H. Wilhelm, late of Company B, First Battalion, and Company B, One hundred and eighty-seventh Regiment, Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Martin Buehler, late of Company B, One hundred and thirtieth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John H. Bogardus, late of Company K, One hundred and eighty-fourth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George N. Taylor, late of Company B, Twenty-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lewis Paul, late of Company H, One hundred and eighty-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Bernard Hardy, late a seaman, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas Stephenson, late of Twenty-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Helen L. Huff, widow of William H. Huff, late of Company C, Seventeenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving: *Provided*, That in the event of the death of Flora Ettie Huff, helpless and dependent child of said William H. Huff, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine: *And provided further*, That in the event of the death of Helen L. Huff, the name of said Flora Ettie Huff shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$12 per month from and after the date of death of said Helen L. Huff.

The name of Egnitz Rensing, late of Company C, Fifth Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Pitsar Ingram, late of Company D, Sixty-fifth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George W. Pierson, late of Company C, Second Regiment Delaware Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Helena G. Marso, widow of Nicholas Marso, late of Company K, Ninety-eighth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Alanson Tilden, late of Fifty-ninth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry Miller, late of Company K, Fifth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John W. Carr, late of Company I, Forty-eighth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alexander Kightlinger, late of Company I, Forty-sixth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles H. Williams, late of Company F, Fifty-third Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Herman Schroeder, late of Company K, Fifty-seventh Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph Taylor, late of Company G, Twenty-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James M. Pulver, late of Twelfth Independent Battery, Ohio Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Michael M. Walters, late of Company I, Seventy-second Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Josiah H. Gordon, late of Company B, Eleventh Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James E. McCracken, late of Company A, Twentieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ellen A. Richardson, widow of George Richardson, late of Company G, Twenty-seventh Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Henry A. Glenn, late of Company E, Sixteenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Robert Smith, late of Company E, One hundred and ninety-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Gardner W. White, late of Company F, Tenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Douglass Luce, late of Forty-fourth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John B. Gillaspie, late of Company G, One hundred and fifty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edmond Ames, late of Company H, One hundred and fifty-third Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Benjamin B. Griffith, late of Company F, One hundred and seventieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Ulysses A. Clayton, late of Company H, Fourteenth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Thomas Waters, late of Fourth Regiment, Tennessee Mounted Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Horace F. Calkins, late of Company F, Second Regiment Connecticut Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Rufus H. Slaymaker, late of Company K, One hundred and first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Eliza A. Platt, widow of Isalah Platt, late of Company G, Third Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Leonard Tressel, late of Company I, One hundred and twentieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William H. Tice, late of Company K, Twenty-first Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James W. Hester, late of Company C, Twenty-ninth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elias Yerger, late of Independent Battery D, Pennsylvania Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Levi S. Moss, late of Company B, Forty-fourth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John E. Whipple, late of Company F, Ninth Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alexander W. Wells, late of Twelfth Battery, Wisconsin Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George McByers, late of Company K, One hundred and twenty-fourth Regiment, and Company I, Thirty-third Regiment, Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Heller, late of Company K, Eleventh Regiment Maryland Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Martha E. Moore, widow of Byron R. Moore, late of Company C, Twenty-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of William G. Richey, late of Company C, One hundred and fifty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles Young, late of Company C, Ninety-first Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Barbaretta Weekly, widow of James A. Weekly, late of Company F, Fifteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of George R. Bowker, late of Company L, Fourteenth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$15 per month.

The name of Barbara Reineck, widow of Daniel Reineck, late of Company G, Eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month.

The name of James B. Erskine, late of Company B, First Regiment, and Company A, Thirty-first Regiment, Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Mary Klopp, widow of Jacob Klopp, late of Fourth Independent Battery, Ohio Light Artillery, and Company H, Sixth Regiment United States Veteran Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Tobias H. Foltz, late of Company H, Twenty-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alfred W. Marshall, late of Company A, Thirtieth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Oscar Johnson, late of Second Independent Battery B, New Jersey Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John W. Watson, late of Company H, Thirtieth Regiment Indiana Infantry, and One hundred and forty-ninth Company, Second Battalion, Veteran Reserve Corps, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samuel E. Keller, late of Company G, Thirteenth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Peter Roberts, late of Company B, Twenty-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George T. Lowry, late of Company G, First Regiment Michigan Sharpshooters, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lewis H. Palmer, late of Company G, Third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William H. Wright, late of Thirty-third Independent Battery, New York Volunteer Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samuel B. Shadle, late of Company A, Eighth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Romanzo A. Coats, late of Company K, Twenty-third Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Byron D. Brown, late of Company E, Ninth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Daniel Hough, late of United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Martin V. B. Wyman, late of Company H, Tenth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George W. Spaulding, late of Company D, Ninth Regiment Vermont Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William H. Cranston, late of Company C, Forty-ninth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John F. Phillips, late of Company C, Twelfth Regiment New Hampshire Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Albert Bennett, late of Company A, Twenty-fifth Regiment New York State Militia Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James Dodwell, late of Battery I, First Illinois Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph C. Cunard, late of Company A, Third Regiment New Jersey Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elijah Smallwood, late of Company G, Thirty-first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Victor E. Burnham, late of Company B, First Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Augustus F. Groff, late of Company F, Seventh Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Hezekiah Bradds, late of Company C, Sixtieth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Knowles, late of Company K, First Regiment Michigan Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George W. Taylor, late of Company I, Third Regiment Iowa Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Miller, late of Company F, Eighty-ninth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Levi Hoy, late of Company D, Sixty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Orrilla S. Jones, widow of Frederic Jones, late of Company C, Forty-first Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Eliza Wilson, widow of George T. Wilson, late of Company H, One hundred and seventy-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Charles R. Miltenberger, late of Company G, Forty-fifth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alice Jerome, widow of Peter Jerome, late of Company E, Fourth Regiment Minnesota Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Ethan A. Mowrer, late a seaman, United States Navy, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Oscar W. Stone, late of Company M, Fifteenth Regiment New York Cavalry, and Company M, Second Regiment New York Provisional Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John W. Newton, late of Company D, Forty-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Franklin Keen, late of Company C, Forty-ninth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James Hobbs, late of Company D, Twenty-first Regiment Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Michael Fivecoate, late of Company L, Tenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samuel Plumb, late of Company G, Ninety-first Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samuel Gaines, late of Company L, Ninth Regiment Missouri State Militia Cavalry, and Company G, Thirteenth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Franklin R. Beamon, late of Company D, First Regiment United States Veteran Engineers, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Nathaniel Gott, late of Battery F, Second Regiment Missouri Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Perry J. Hainey, late of Company A, Sixteenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Alfred C. Mullinax, late of Company I, Second Regiment Missouri Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Solomon Kessinger, late of Company F, Twenty-fourth Regiment, and Company C, Twenty-first Regiment, Missouri Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William R. Gray, late of Company F, Eighth Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William Jones, late of Company C, Ninety-seventh Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Isaac N. Estep, late of Company M, Second Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of George W. Miller, late Unassigned, One hundred and forty-third Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John A. Medley, late of Company G, Ninth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Erasmus Bucy, late of Company D, First Regiment, and Company G, Second Regiment, West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Dorothy Fisher, widow of John Fisher, late of Company A, Sixth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Benjamin Applin, late of Company C, Seventeenth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Felix Dodd, late of Company G, Sixth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Charles Grant, late of Company C, Eighteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edward H. Williams, late of Company I, One hundred and seventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Margaret Umphenour, widow of Francis M. Umphenour, late of Company D, Twentieth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Alfred D. Collier, late of Company K, First Regiment, and Company D, Forty-fourth Regiment, Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and

pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elsie A. Mahana, widow of Richard M. Mahana, late of Company A, First Regiment Colorado Volunteer Cavalry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Robert C. Cowell, late of Company D, Twelfth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William W. Hudson, late of Company M, Eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Marion Vandiver, late of Company B, Third Regiment Missouri Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Otto Höhn, late of Twelfth Battery, Wisconsin Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Andrew C. Perkins, late of Company K, Twenty-fourth Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Eliza Moshier, widow of Philip Moshier, late of Company K, Sixteenth Regiment New York Heavy Artillery, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of William W. Keen, late of Company F, Eighty-seventh Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samuel Gibson, late of Company K, Nineteenth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John H. Stratton, late of Company G, One hundred and fifty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William J. Platt, late of Company E, Fiftieth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Israel Sheppard, late of Company B, Fifteenth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Hanes, alias George Hanes, late of Company F, Ninety-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William H. H. Sheppard, late of Company H, One hundred and eighty-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James S. Frizzell, late of Company H, Second Regiment New York Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph Moyer, late of Company A, One hundred and third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John Cochran, late of Company A, Third Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Norman L. McCausland, late of Company I, Eleventh Regiment Rhode Island Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of James Young, late of Battery H, First Regiment West Virginia Light Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samuel H. Sloan, late of Company L, Sixth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samuel A. Robertson, late of Company D, First Regiment Kansas Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Aristine H. Wells, widow of Francis V. B. Wells, late of Company F, Seventh Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Henry Nance, late of Company D, Ninth Regiment United States Colored Heavy Artillery, and Company K, One hundredth Regiment United States Colored Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Samuel W. Vanpelt, late of Company E, One hundred and ninety-third Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Edward G. Hall, late of Company I, Seventh Regiment Tennessee Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elizabeth Roland, widow of Henry Roland, late of Company B, Two hundred and fifth Regiment Pennsylvania Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Samuel Tolbert, late of Company E, Twenty-second Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Levi Coon, late of Company E, Fifty-third Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lucy C. Collin, widow of Joseph R. Collin, late of Company H, Twenty-third Regiment Wisconsin Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$24 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

Provided, That in the event of the death of John T. Collin, helpless and dependent child of said Joseph R. Collin, the additional pension herein granted shall cease and determine; *And provided further*, That in the event of the death of Lucy C. Collin, the name of said John T. Collin shall be placed on the pension roll, subject to the provisions and limitations of the pension laws, at the rate of \$12 per month from and after the date of death of said Lucy C. Collin.

The name of Arberry Estes, late of Company C, Fourteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Elias T. Newman, late of Company C, Fourteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry C. Orvis, late of Company D, Twelfth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$27 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John R. Woods, late of Company G, Seventy-second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and Company I, Tenth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Eli Mathews, late of Company D, Seventy-eighth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joshua Blakely, late of Company E, Eighth Regiment United States Veteran Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lucinda J. Jay, widow of William A. Jay, late of Company F, Eighth Regiment Kansas Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Laura A. Rice, helpless and dependent child of Edward C. Rice, late of Company C, Sixth Regiment Massachusetts Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Enos Snodgrass, late of Company I, Sixth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Silas M. Starkey, late of Company H, Fourteenth Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of John W. Klumph, late of Company A, Fifteenth Regiment Iowa Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henry C. Shepherd, late of Company K, First Regiment West Virginia Infantry, and Company D, Second Regiment West Virginia Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Lloyd Criswell, late of Company G, Second Regiment West Virginia Veteran Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Emily W. Lathrop, widow of Elias A. Lathrop, late of Company B, Eleventh Regiment Maine Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Noah Hardy, late of Company C, Eleventh Regiment Illinois Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Joseph E. Burkhart, late of Company A, Sixth Regiment Pennsylvania Volunteer Heavy Artillery, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Minerva C. McMillan, helpless and dependent child of James W. McMillan, late of Twenty-first Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$12 per month.

The name of Eugene B. Eastman, late of Company H, Fifty-second Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William W. Day, late of Company F, Sixteenth Regiment New York Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William A. Griner, late of Company E, One hundred and eighty-fifth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$36 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William W. Townley, late of Company D, Ninety-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Luther Sealey, late of Company B, Eighty-sixth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Anderson Amlis, late of Company I, Fourteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$50 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of William W. Bailey, late of Company D, One hundred and forty-fourth Regiment Illinois Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Henrietta Nokes, widow of Oscar Nokes, late of Company F, Twenty-sixth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay her a pension at the rate of \$20 per month in lieu of that she is now receiving.

The name of Shadrack Combs, late of Company M, Fourteenth Regiment Kentucky Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

The name of Jeremiah Hall, late of Company C, Eighty-sixth Regiment Indiana Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

This bill is a substitute for the following House bills referred to the Committee on Invalid Pensions:

H. R. 814. Rachel A. Dougherty.	H. R. 5656. Clem E. I. Ambler.
H. R. 856. John I. Israel.	H. R. 5754. Henry W. Wise.
H. R. 1109. Joseph M. Ford.	H. R. 5845. George W. McCurdy.
H. R. 1370. Frank M. Douglass.	H. R. 6244. Alva French.
H. R. 1439. Tillie C. Wood.	H. R. 6268. Robert Daulton.
H. R. 1503. Mary E. Ryan.	H. R. 6722. Cyrenous Dalley.
H. R. 1597. Samuel Frankenberg.	H. R. 6749. John C. Lloyd.
H. R. 1803. Zachariah Stephens.	H. R. 6974. John Jeffers.
H. R. 1807. Hanbill Combs.	H. R. 6979. Sarah M. Chandler.
H. R. 1809. Joseph Dyer.	H. R. 7067. Francis Prafer.
H. R. 1813. Thomas A. Burton.	H. R. 7249. Edward P. Payne.
H. R. 1886. John C. Steele.	H. R. 7279. James T. Wilson.
H. R. 1910. Cordelia Briggs.	H. R. 7470. Hiram F. Butler.
H. R. 2012. Jeremiah Hall.	H. R. 7524. James H. Campbell.
H. R. 2017. Jephtha Litteral.	H. R. 7525. James W. Allen.
H. R. 2045. Charles W. Bullard.	H. R. 7663. Mary E. Wrigley.
H. R. 2152. Matilda A. Miller.	H. R. 8104. Thomas M. Patton.
H. R. 2651. Elza P. Hanger.	H. R. 8161. Thomas Hanway.
H. R. 2695. Henry Wolf.	H. R. 8214. Ira A. Goodridge.
H. R. 2702. John Pierpoint.	H. R. 8308. Huldah Melissa Fleming.
H. R. 2859. M. Ellen T. Harris.	H. R. 8445. Aaron M. Van Sickle.
H. R. 3726. Lyman O. Leach.	H. R. 8454. Lucinda Gardner.
H. R. 3818. Mary Hurd.	H. R. 8590. Robert B. Toder.
H. R. 4066. Jennie D. Bigelow.	H. R. 8633. Albert Platt.
H. R. 4366. John D. Vine.	H. R. 8699. Thomas B. McClane.
H. R. 4374. William D. Smith.	H. R. 8742. David Gilchrist.
H. R. 4540. Marshall C. Conroe.	H. R. 8860. John W. Fuels.
H. R. 4836. Alexander Swisher.	H. R. 8885. Collingwood Boulter.
H. R. 4848. John F. Michael.	H. R. 8948. Lena Hilker.
H. R. 5015. William B. King.	H. R. 8971. Stephen F. Cassaday.
H. R. 5056. Frank Lauderback.	H. R. 9160. Jesse Price.
H. R. 5424. Cyrus Trough.	H. R. 9289. Andrew Glenn.
H. R. 5465. William H. Clouser.	H. R. 9447. Joseph E. Stafford.
H. R. 5536. John Derf.	H. R. 9501. E. M. a line Catharine Lindner.
H. R. 5544. Amos E. Evans.	H. R. 9592. William H. Banks.
H. R. 5573. Angelcernelles Wetherby.	H. R. 9629. Henry C. Brown.
H. R. 5594. Leander McGrew.	H. R. 9787. Thomas Phillips.
	H. R. 9799. Charles Van Auker.

H. R. 9881. George W. Flesher.
H. R. 10105. Josiah Shoemaker.
H. R. 10217. Otto G. Hauschildt.
H. R. 10418. George Huffman.
H. R. 10523. John Huey.
H. R. 10540. Benjamin U. Earhart.
H. R. 10592. Henriette L. Eggert.
H. R. 10611. Owen B. Vaughn.
H. R. 10709. Charles E. Case.
H. R. 10735. Joseph Nichols.
H. R. 10806. Lewis Leib.
H. R. 10978. Otway C. Chase.
H. R. 11008. John A. Neff.
H. R. 11017. Mordecai M. Duke.
H. R. 11041. William H. Williams.
H. R. 11318. Marshall Fernald.
H. R. 11396. David Johnson.
H. R. 11494. Readding Everitt.
H. R. 11553. Aaron Ready.
H. R. 11602. George Lee.
H. R. 11688. Charles W. Smith.
H. R. 11740. Stephen A. West.
H. R. 11802. John H. Punshon.
H. R. 11887. Rose Reindl.
H. R. 12082. Hollingsworth Gipe.
H. R. 12157. Joseph Clucas.
H. R. 12236. Benjamin F. Fry.
H. R. 12322. Margaret O'Leary.
H. R. 12373. William Welsh.
H. R. 12382. Ludlow B. Ward.
H. R. 12522. George H. Ross.
H. R. 12598. Henry J. Knapp.
H. R. 12683. Benjamin F. Storer.
H. R. 12898. Jacob Booth.
H. R. 13128. William C. Douglas.
H. R. 13248. Alonzo Pendland.
H. R. 13306. George W. Wolfgang.
H. R. 13367. Curtis C. Griffin.
H. R. 13460. Joseph B. Hanawalt.
H. R. 13509. James R. Collins.
H. R. 13596. Henry W. Redman.
H. R. 13626. William W. Prather.
H. R. 13647. Petra G. Cordova.
H. R. 13686. Charles O. Manley.
H. R. 13739. Charles S. Hubbard.
H. R. 13779. William Donnelly.
H. R. 13799. Daniel O. Root.
H. R. 13930. Phillip McKinney.
H. R. 13965. Elliott M. Lydick.
H. R. 14004. Alpheus P. Gray.
H. R. 14048. George Lloyd.
H. R. 14272. George G. Sherlock.
H. R. 14282. Philip H. Sipe.
H. R. 14356. Amos Potter.
H. R. 14371. Charles E. Bradish.
H. R. 14609. Lewis H. Lake.
H. R. 14691. Robert J. Bingham.
H. R. 14828. Franklin D. Russell.
H. R. 14885. William Dolson.
H. R. 14911. John Critchfield.
H. R. 14958. Cornelius McCafferty.
H. R. 14988. Charles Robinson.
H. R. 15028. Virgil A. Phillips.
H. R. 15085. Joseph L. True.
H. R. 15104. Houston Lemon.
H. R. 15192. John Nay.
H. R. 15220. St. Clair Fechner.
H. R. 15223. Joseph Wardle.
H. R. 15272. Samuel Huddleston.
H. R. 15323. Frederick Brunner.
H. R. 15369. Edward N. Webb.
H. R. 15377. Christopher Dehlen.
H. R. 15405. Elbridge Diltz.
H. R. 15409. Charles F. Walters.
H. R. 15486. Annie M. France.
H. R. 15487. James A. Thompson.
H. R. 15495. Elmer S. Battin.
H. R. 15500. Henry O. Nickerson.
H. R. 15587. Samuel E. Edmundson.
H. R. 15596. Lewis W. Mills.
H. R. 15659. James Livingstone.
H. R. 15689. Robert R. C. Grant.
H. R. 15693. Thomas Larkin.
H. R. 15727. Rowland S. True.
H. R. 15803. Azor M. Nixon.
H. R. 15861. Laura S. Pritchard.
H. R. 15891. John C. Young.
H. R. 15919. William C. Barnett.
H. R. 15945. William R. Smith.
H. R. 15960. Harmon Blackburn.
H. R. 16005. John T. Wallin.
H. R. 16021. Samuel Shoup.
H. R. 16022. William H. Cullens.
H. R. 16057. Andrew Kerr.
H. R. 16059. Belle P. Wolfe.
H. R. 16082. David M. Crow.
H. R. 16084. Ledyard E. Beaton.
H. R. 16164. Melissa Ann Lett.
H. R. 16189. Morris W. Hackman.
H. R. 16214. James A. Shequin.
H. R. 16224. J. Harrison Rennard.
H. R. 16242. Delight A. Allen.
H. R. 16246. George R. Peacock.
H. R. 16273. George H. Check.
H. R. 16333. Isalah E. Lawrence.
H. R. 16336. James Curtis.
H. R. 16339. John Conkle.
H. R. 16450. Hattie A. McGuire.
H. R. 16488. Alethea L. Sands.
H. R. 16496. Margaret McEvoy.
H. R. 16517. William H. Brown.
H. R. 16518. Daniel Culver.
H. R. 16588. John N. Kirkendall.

H. R. 16539. Mary E. Filppo.
H. R. 16596. John Cragan.
H. R. 16616. Lucy W. Lockwood.
H. R. 16626. Martin Cade.
H. R. 16720. John F. Scofield.
H. R. 16724. David Freid.
H. R. 16725. Francis R. Culp.
H. R. 16728. William H. Wilhelm.
H. R. 16731. Martin Buehler.
H. R. 16732. John H. Bogardus.
H. R. 16773. George N. Taylor.
H. R. 16784. Lewis Paul.
H. R. 16786. Bernard Hardy.
H. R. 16835. Thomas Stephenson.
H. R. 16863. Helen L. Huff.
H. R. 16877. Egnitz Rensing.
H. R. 16898. Pitsar Ingram.
H. R. 16909. George W. Plerson.
H. R. 16927. Helena G. Marso.
H. R. 16965. Alanson Tilden.
H. R. 17003. Henry Miller.
H. R. 17032. John W. Carr.
H. R. 17035. Alexander Kightlinger.
H. R. 17039. Charles H. Williams.
H. R. 17100. Herman Schroeder.
H. R. 17109. Joseph Taylor.
H. R. 17134. James M. Pulver.
H. R. 17152. Michael M. Walters.
H. R. 17241. Josiah H. Gordon.
H. R. 17266. James E. McCracken.
H. R. 17274. Ellen A. Richardson.
H. R. 17325. Henry A. Glenn.
H. R. 17332. Robert Smith.
H. R. 17335. Gardner W. White.
H. R. 17434. Douglass Lupe.
H. R. 17449. John B. Gillaspie.
H. R. 17529. Edmond Ames.
H. R. 17538. Benjamin B. Griffith.
H. R. 17552. Ulysses A. Clayton.
H. R. 17614. Thomas Waters.
H. R. 17726. Horace F. Calkins.
H. R. 17738. Rufus H. Slaymaker.
H. R. 17776. Eliza A. Platt.
H. R. 17862. Leonard Tressel.
H. R. 17866. William H. Tice.
H. R. 17885. James W. Hester.
H. R. 17891. Elias Yeager.
H. R. 17903. Levi S. Moss.
H. R. 17911. John E. Whipple.
H. R. 17919. Alexander W. Wells.
H. R. 17918. George McByers.
H. R. 17921. William Heller.
H. R. 17931. Martha E. Moore.
H. R. 17935. William G. Ritchey.
H. R. 17945. Charles Young.
H. R. 17948. Barbaretta Weekly.
H. R. 17955. George B. Bowker.
H. R. 17959. Barbara Reineck.
H. R. 17973. James B. Erskine.
H. R. 18005. Mary Klopp.
H. R. 18023. Tobias H. Foltz.
H. R. 18024. Alfred W. Marshall.
H. R. 18028. Oscar Johnson.
H. R. 18031. John W. Watson.
H. R. 18032. Samuel E. Keller.
H. R. 18033. Peter Roberts.
H. R. 18034. George T. Lowry.
H. R. 18035. Lewis H. Palmer.
H. R. 18037. William H. Wright.
H. R. 18043. Samuel B. Shadle.
H. R. 18045. Romanzo A. Coats.
H. R. 18048. Byron D. Brown.
H. R. 18049. Daniel Hough.
H. R. 18052. Martin V. B. Wyman.
H. R. 18054. George W. Spaulding.
H. R. 18067. William H. Cranston.
H. R. 18070. John F. Phillips.
H. R. 18072. Albert Bennett.
H. R. 18091. James Dodwell.
H. R. 18096. Joseph C. Cunard.
H. R. 18101. Elijah Smallwood.
H. R. 18106. Victor E. Burnham.
H. R. 18107. Augustus F. Groff.
H. R. 18108. Hezekiah Brads.
H. R. 18110. John Knowles.
H. R. 18111. George W. Taylor.
H. R. 18114. John Miller.
H. R. 18137. Levi Hoy.
H. R. 18147. Orrilla S. Jones.
H. R. 18154. Eliza Wilson.
H. R. 18158. Charles R. Miltenberger.
H. R. 18176. Alice Jerome.
H. R. 18178. Ethan A. Mowrer.
H. R. 18179. Oscar W. Stone.
H. R. 18200. John W. Newton.
H. R. 18201. Franklin Keen.
H. R. 18202. James Hobbs.
H. R. 18203. Michael Fivecoate.
H. R. 18204. Samuel Plumb.
H. R. 18205. Samuel Gaines.
H. R. 18206. Franklin R. Beamon.
H. R. 18207. Nathaniel Gott.
H. R. 18270. Perry J. Hainey.
H. R. 18218. Alfred C. Mullinax.
H. R. 18219. Solomon Kessinger.
H. R. 18220. William R. Gray.
H. R. 18221. William Jones.
H. R. 18222. Isaac N. Estep.
H. R. 18226. George W. Miller.
H. R. 18268. John A. Medley.
H. R. 18305. Erasmus Bucy.
H. R. 18308. Dorothy Fisher.
H. R. 18311. Benjamin Applin.

H. R. 18325. Felix Dodd.
H. R. 18348. Charles Grant.
H. R. 18350. Edward H. Williams.
H. R. 18352. Margaret Umphenour.
H. R. 18360. Alfred D. Collier.
H. R. 18386. Elsie A. Mahana.
H. R. 18394. Robert C. Cowell.
H. R. 18402. William W. Hudson.
H. R. 18464. Marion Vandiver.
H. R. 18478. Otto Hohn.
H. R. 18479. Andrew C. Perkins.
H. R. 18496. Eliza Moshier.
H. R. 18556. William W. Keen.
H. R. 18557. Samuel Gibson.
H. R. 18559. John H. Stratton.
H. R. 18583. William J. Platt.
H. R. 18610. Israel Sheppard.
H. R. 18612. John Hanes, alias George Hanes.
H. R. 18614. William H. II. Sheppard.
H. R. 18615. James S. Frizzell.
H. R. 18616. Joseph Moyer.
H. R. 18621. John Cochran.
H. R. 18653. Norman L. McCausland.
H. R. 18690. James Young.
H. R. 18691. Samuel H. Sloan.
H. R. 18692. Samuel A. Robertson.
H. R. 18700. Arstine H. Wells.
H. R. 18701. Henry Nance.
H. R. 18702. Samuel W. Vanpelt.

H. R. 18703. Edward G. Hall.
H. R. 18751. Elizabeth Roland.
H. R. 18793. Samuel Tolbert.
H. R. 18803. Levi Coon.
H. R. 18839. Lucy C. Collin.
H. R. 18841. Arberry Estes.
H. R. 18842. Elias T. Newman.
H. R. 18858. Henry C. Orvis.
H. R. 18859. John R. Woods.
H. R. 18887. Eli Mathews.
H. R. 18929. Joshua Blakely.
H. R. 18931. Lucinda J. Jay.
H. R. 18974. Laura A. Rice.
H. R. 19007. Enos Snodgrass.
H. R. 19008. Silas M. Starkey.
H. R. 19026. John W. Klumph.
H. R. 19038. Henry C. Shepherd.
H. R. 19046. Lloyd Criswell.
H. R. 19098. Emily W. Lothrop.
H. R. 19110. Noah Hardy.
H. R. 19141. Joseph E. Burkhart.
H. R. 19170. Minerva C. McMillan.
H. R. 19172. Eugene B. Eastman.
H. R. 19243. William W. Day.
H. R. 19365. William A. Griner.
H. R. 19366. William W. Townley.
H. R. 19367. Luther Sealey.
H. R. 19384. Anderson Amis.
H. R. 19456. William W. Bailey.
H. R. 19550. Henrietta Nokes.
H. R. 19756. Shadrack Combs.

Mr. FOSTER took the chair as Speaker pro tempore.

The Clerk read as follows:

The name of Hanbill Combs, late of Company D, One hundred and eighty-eighth Regiment Ohio Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving.

Mr. ADAIR. Mr. Speaker, I offer a committee amendment. On page 3, line 3, strike out the figures "40" and insert the figures "50."

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The gentleman from Indiana offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend on page 3, in line 3, by striking out "40" and inserting "50."

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Speaker, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. ADAIR. I will.

Mr. STAFFORD. Will the gentleman explain to the House the reason which actuated the committee in making that change, and what policy it pursues when making these increased allowances above the amount provided by the general law?

Mr. ADAIR. I will say to the gentleman from Wisconsin that when the committee considered this bill there was some evidence on the way that had not reached the committee, and the Member introducing the bill was instructed to present to the committee as soon as it arrived the additional evidence showing that this claimant required the constant attention and care of another person, and after the bill was printed that evidence was placed in the hands of the committee.

Mr. STAFFORD. Then, as I understand the gentleman, every soldier requiring the constant attendance of another person for his care receives a pension of \$50?

Mr. ADAIR. That depends on the length of his service, but if the service was reasonably long, we give him \$50 a month.

Mr. LANGLEY. If the gentleman will permit me, the testimony shows that this soldier is totally blind, and has been for a number of months, in addition to being otherwise physically disabled.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Hold old is he?

Mr. LANGLEY. Seventy-five years old.

Mr. STAFFORD. How long must a man have served in order to obtain \$50 under these circumstances?

Mr. ADAIR. If his service was a year or more, the committee have been giving \$50 a month, if he has no other income and his condition is such that he requires the constant care and attendance of another person.

Mr. STAFFORD. What other amounts are allowed, where an applicant is in such a condition?

Mr. ADAIR. From \$40 a month to \$50 a month, depending upon the length of service.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Is not this an unusual amount to give?

Mr. ADAIR. No; it is not an unusual amount in cases where a man is helpless and requires the attention of another person, and is blind.

Mr. SLAYDEN. Has this been the practice?

Mr. ADAIR. It has been the practice right along.

The SPEAKER. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana.

The amendment was agreed to.

On motion of Mr. ADAIR, the following committee amendments were offered, severally considered, and agreed to:

Page 8, strike out lines 9, 10, and 11, as follows:
"The name of Robert Daulton, late of Company K, Seventh Regiment West Virginia Volunteer Cavalry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$40 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving."

Page 23, strike out lines 19, 20, 21, and 22, as follows:
 "The name of William Dolson, late of Company C, Twenty-ninth Regiment Michigan Volunteer Infantry, and pay him a pension at the rate of \$30 per month in lieu of that he is now receiving."
 Page 36, in line 11, strike out the name "Pitsar" and insert "Pitzer."
 Page 49, line 19, insert the dollar sign before the figures 36.
 Page 51, line 17, strike out the word "Eramus" and insert the word "Erasmus."

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I move to strike out the last word. I would like to ask the chairman or some member of the committee if it is true that the Committee on Invalid Pensions has adopted a rule under which the committee will not consider special bills for members of soldiers' homes?

Mr. ADAIR. There is no rule of that kind adopted by the committee.

Mr. ANTHONY. Why does your committee, then, refuse to consider bills for soldiers who are members of the soldiers' homes? I have had several bills turned down on that pretext. If your committee has adopted a policy of refusing to do it, I think you ought to include it in the printed rule so that this House and the country may know.

Mr. ADAIR. I have just stated that so far as I know no rule of that kind has been adopted.

Mr. ANTHONY. I have had communications from the committee regarding bills which they claimed were turned down on that ground.

Mr. ASHBROOK. There has been no rule adopted to that effect, but we have adopted that policy; that is the policy of the committee.

Mr. ANTHONY. That is the understanding on the part of the committee?

Mr. ASHBROOK. Yes.

Mr. ANTHONY. Why should it not then be printed in the rules of the committee?

Mr. ASHBROOK. I think it should.

Mr. ANTHONY. Well, Mr. Speaker, I want to protest against a rule of that kind, because it works unjustly against deserving soldiers who are members of soldiers' homes. On the face of it it looks as if it was all right, that these men are receiving certain privileges from the Government and are apparently from that standpoint not deserving of increased pensions, but I want to say to the House that the majority of the members of the soldiers' homes are there suffering from ailments, or crippled to a degree which incapacitates them from earning a livelihood, and makes them more deserving of pensions than many who are outside the homes. I think it is unfair and unjust.

Mr. ASHBROOK. If the gentleman will permit me, does he not believe that inasmuch as the soldiers are occupying homes, getting their board and lodging and the attendance of a physician, that they ought not to be entitled to as large pensions as those who are outside the homes?

Mr. ANTHONY. There is some justice in the gentleman's argument in some instances perhaps, but most of them come to the home because they can not maintain themselves outside on the pensions they receive, and they come for medical treatment. They would like to live outside. I would like to see the most deserving members of our soldiers' homes receive sufficiently increased pensions so that if they wished they could live outside instead of being forced to stay in a soldiers' home, and then be deprived of an increase of pension for that reason.

Mr. ASHBROOK. So far as my knowledge goes the majority of the soldiers who are inmates of the homes have no families that could care for them; they go there because they have no homes of their own. It seems to me that the soldiers in the homes are better cared for than those who are not there.

Mr. ANTHONY. If you granted the members of the soldiers' homes the same pensions that you do the man outside in the majority of cases they would leave the home and no longer become a burden on the Government.

Mr. ASHBROOK. If there could be some guaranty that the soldier would do that I would be in favor of granting him the same pension.

Mr. ANTHONY. Let me put it this way. If the veteran would state that if he is granted an adequate increase of pension that he would leave the home, would that make any difference?

Mr. ADAIR. It has not been the experience at Marion, Ind., that those who receive the larger pensions leave the home after they receive the pensions.

Mr. ANTHONY. I think it is unjust discrimination, and I am in hopes the committee will liberalize its position in reference to many deserving soldiers who have been compelled to enter a soldiers' home.

Mr. SULLOWAY. Mr. Speaker, I will say that so far as my observation is concerned—and I have been on the committee some time—that substantially all of these men when in the homes, if they were given the pensions that they ought to have,

would take care of themselves outside. They do not like to be held as prisoners or paupers. It has been my effort to raise the pension to what it ought to be and let them take care of themselves if they want to. They are entitled to their rights here, and should not be told that they are to be shut up somewhere else, and that they are just as well off. Perhaps some of us would be better off shut up somewhere else, but as a matter of fact it is an iniquitous way to do business.

Mr. ANTHONY. Mr. Speaker, I am glad to hear the gentleman from New Hampshire say that, and I believe it is the right policy for the committee.

The Clerk concluded the reading of the bill.

The SPEAKER pro tempore (Mr. FOSTER). The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

On motion of Mr. ADAIR, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bill was passed was laid on the table.

BRIDGES ACROSS ALLEGHENY RIVER, PA.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, I call up the bill (S. 7536) authorizing the Western New York & Pennsylvania Railway Co. to reconstruct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Allegheny River, in the borough of Warren and township of Pleasant, Warren County, Pa., which is on the Speaker's table, and ask the Chair to lay it before the House, a similar House bill being upon the calendar.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair lays before the House the bill S. 7536, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Western New York & Pennsylvania Railway Co., a railroad corporation organized and existing under the laws of the States of New York and Pennsylvania, be, and it is hereby, authorized to reconstruct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Allegheny River on the location of the existing structure and suitable to the interests of navigation, partly in the borough of Warren and partly in the township of Pleasant, county of Warren, and State of Pennsylvania, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled, "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters, approved March 23, 1906."

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the engrossment and third reading of the bill.

The bill was ordered to be engrossed and read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

By unanimous consent a similar House bill (H. R. 19296) on the House Calendar, was laid on the table.

Mr. ADAMSON. Mr. Speaker, there is another bill of the same nature on the Speaker's table (S. 7538) authorizing the Western New York & Pennsylvania Railway Co. to reconstruct, maintain, and operate a bridge across the Allegheny River, in Glade and Kinzua Townships, Warren County, Pa., and I ask the Chair to lay that before the House, and that a similar House bill (H. R. 19297) on the calendar be laid on the table.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The Chair lays before the House the bill S. 7538, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Be it enacted, etc., That the Western New York & Pennsylvania Railway Co., a railroad corporation organized and existing under the laws of the States of New York and Pennsylvania, be, and it is hereby, authorized to reconstruct, maintain, and operate a bridge and approaches thereto across the Allegheny River, on the location of the existing structure and suitable to the interests of navigation, in Glade and Kinzua Townships, county of Warren, and State of Pennsylvania, in accordance with the provisions of the act entitled "An act to regulate the construction of bridges over navigable waters," approved March 23, 1906.

SEC. 2. That the right to alter, amend, or repeal this act is hereby expressly reserved.

The SPEAKER pro tempore. The question is on the third reading of the Senate bill.

The bill was ordered to be read a third time, was read the third time, and passed.

A similar House bill, H. R. 19297, was laid on the table.

On motion of Mr. ADAMSON, a motion to reconsider the vote by which the bills were passed was laid on the table.

POST OFFICE APPROPRIATION BILL.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House resolve itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the bill H. R. 19410, the Post Office appropriation bill.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the House resolved itself into the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union for the further consideration of the Post Office appropriation bill, with Mr. CHASE in the chair.

The CHAIRMAN. When the bill was last under consideration there was an amendment pending, offered by the gentleman from Indiana, Mr. Cox, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Page 10, line 23, strike out all of lines 23, 24, 25, on page 10, and lines 1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, and down to the word "grade" in line 8, page 11.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, on yesterday I inserted in the RECORD a letter addressed to me by the Postmaster General as to what the cost would be if this amendment is not agreed to. That letter will be found on page 1229 of the RECORD. It is proposed to increase the salaries of 7,610 clerks in the first-class post offices, at a cost of \$705,825, and of 2,037 clerks in the second-class post offices, at a cost of \$176,350, making a total increase of \$882,175. The post-office clerks are a very competent and efficient class of men. They do splendid work; but I undertake to say that as a class they are the most favored class of all of the employees in the Government. They are paid higher salaries than the employees working in any other department of the Government. They are paid salaries from 15 to 30 per cent higher than are paid to the employees by private employers in that line of work. I do not guess at those figures at all. I speak authoritatively on the point when I make the statement, especially if men in the high financial world know what it costs them to run and operate their business. It is only a few years ago—four or five—that the Committee on Appropriations called in before it the heads of some of the largest concerns in the United States, heads of railroads and great banking and manufacturing institutions, and heard those men compare the wages they were paying to their employees with what the Government was paying its employees; and I make the statement that the employees of the Government, and especially in the Post Office Department, are paid from 15 to 30 per cent higher wages than the private employers pay for a similar line of work. I do not know as yet whether this 5 and 10 per cent increase will be added, because I do not know whether a rule is coming in, nor do I know what the Senate will do when the bill gets over there. In order to meet that proposition, and in order to get something into the RECORD that some one somewhere, either at this end or the other end of the Capitol, will read, as well as over the country, I shall put into the RECORD a letter written to me by Mr. Koons, the First Assistant Postmaster General, as to how much the 5 and 10 per cent increase, if incorporated into this bill, will add to it. The amount it would add is \$13,195,940.

This bill carries automatic promotions to the amount of \$2,800,000, and that, together with the 5 and 10 per cent increase, if added to the bill, would increase the appropriation for the Post Office Department by the sum of approximately \$16,000,000. That letter, with the permission of the committee, I shall insert at this point:

POST OFFICE DEPARTMENT,
FIRST ASSISTANT POSTMASTER GENERAL,
Washington, January 6, 1917.

Hon. W. E. COX,
House of Representatives.

MY DEAR MR. COX: In response to your recent inquiry as to the amount of money it will require if the amendment which has passed the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads to increase the salaries of all postal employees whose salaries do not exceed \$1,800 is enacted into law, I wish to advise in order to meet this increase in compensation it will require approximately \$25,000 for the office of the Postmaster General, \$6,320.940 for the Bureau of the First Assistant, \$1,650,000 for the Bureau of the Second Assistant, and \$5,200,000 for the Bureau of the Fourth Assistant, or a total of \$13,195,940. In addition to this, the bill already provides for increases to the amount of \$2,800,000 to take care of the automatic promotions, or a total of approximately \$16,000,000 will be needed to take care of both items.

Sincerely, yours,

J. C. KOONS,
First Assistant Postmaster General.

The argument has been made here time and again, session after session, that the Government ought to be a model employer; that it ought to at least pay its employees as much as private concerns pay theirs, and for the benefit of the Members of the House who have heretofore made that argument I am going to ask leave again in a few moments to incorporate another tabulation in the RECORD which completely overthrows that argument. The Member of this House who believes for one moment that the Government does not pay its employees higher wages, at least at initial employment, than do private manufacturers is totally mistaken.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has expired.

Mr. COX. I ask unanimous consent to proceed for five minutes more.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I asked the Second Assistant Postmaster General to give me a tabulation showing what the railway postal clerks and department clerks were earning at the time they went upon the eligible list—that is, in private employment. Of course, he could not give them all, but I have in my

hand the names of 150 men who are now upon the eligible list from the States of Texas, Missouri, California, and Pennsylvania, four representative States, in different sections of the country, representing different economic conditions. These men are now on the eligible list, waiting to be called as departmental clerks in the post offices of the first and second classes and city letter carriers in cities of the same classes.

Now, to the Members who believe that the Government should be a model employer, I think if you will read this statement after I put it in the RECORD, you will come to the conclusion that the Government is a model employer if you mean by that term the Government should pay its employees as much as private employers pay them. When they take the civil-service examination for these places of railway postal clerks and departmental clerks they are required to state the amount of wages they were earning at private employment. Mr. Chairman, but few—you can count them on the fingers of one hand—of these 150 men were getting as much in private employment as they got at the initial employment when they go to work for the Government. This report shows that these 150 men were earning at the time they stood the civil-service examination and went upon the eligible list from \$1.50 a day to \$15 per week. Now, this list is the highest one upon the eligible list from these four States, and the wages they were earning in private employment at the time they stood the civil-service examination, I repeat, ranged all the way from \$1.50 per day to approximately \$15 per week. Now, I am not saying that is enough. No; I wish it were possible that all the laborers of this country could receive higher wages and higher salaries than they do in private employment. But as a rule I take it that employers are humane, that they pay their employees all they can afford to pay. That is my notion about it. I put this in or make this statement to meet the argument that has been made upon the floor of the House for the increase of these salaries upon that ground.

Now, gentlemen, are we prepared to deliberately vote out of the Treasury of the United States \$880,000? Are you prepared to do it? Do you propose to get any better service for it? Oh, no; that is not the purpose that you vote it, for you are getting as good service as you will ever get, and you are getting good service, there is no question about that. Upon what ground, then, do you propose to vote this increased salary to-day of \$880,000? Upon the ground of the high cost of living? Is that the ground upon which you put it? Do you believe you are doing justice or right to the laboring people back in your districts who are working for \$1.50 a day by imposing this tax upon them to pay these increases in salaries?

Mr. EMERSON rose.

Mr. COX. I can not yield. There is not a Member on the floor of this House but if you look back to the respective districts you can count by the scores if not by the thousands people who are earning \$1.50 and \$2.50 a day. Why, the average farm laborers of this country are only earning \$120 a year, or \$10 per month. The average wages paid to school-teachers throughout the United States is only \$456 a year, and yet the proposition comes before this House to increase the salary of 7,000 or 8,000 employees to the extent of passing a charge upon the Treasury of the United States of upward of \$880,000. Can we Democrats consistently vote it? Can any Democrat, charged with the responsibility of collecting and disbursing the revenues of this Government, run his arm into the Treasury of the United States to that extent?

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman from Indiana has again expired.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the RECORD by inserting the matter indicated.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks in the RECORD. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

The matter referred to is as follows:

Railway Mail Service eligibles.
TEXAS.

Name.	Address.	Occupation.	Salary.
Cleburns	Denison	Laborer	\$50 per month.
Denison	Denison	Clerk, railroad office	\$70 per month.
Corsicana	Denison	Student	
Hamlin	Denison	School-teacher	\$75 per month.
Denison	Denison	Cashier	Do.
Do.	Denison	Grocer clerk	\$10 per week.
Sweetwater	Denison	Farm	
Do.	Denison	Student	
Alamogordo	Denison	School-teacher	\$85 per month.
Dallas	Denison	Bookkeeper	\$75 per month.
Speepleville	Denison	Clerk	\$720 per annum.

Railway Mail Service eligibles—Continued.
TEXAS—continued.

Name.	Address.	Occupation.	Salary.
Cisco		School-teacher	\$65 per month.
Spur		Rural delivery service.	Do.
Wells		Mill foreman	Do.
Fort Worth		Street railway motorman	\$90 per month.
Dallas		Order clerk	\$12 per week.
Canyon			
Vigo Route, Tulla		School-teacher	\$75 per month.
North Fort Worth		Fireman	\$65 per month.
Canyon		Groceryman	\$40 per month.
Lyons		School-teacher	\$90 per month.
Greenville		Laborer	
Fort Worth		Assistant to bookkeeper	\$40 per month.
Stamford		Hotel hall-boy	\$20 per month.
Fort Worth		Porter	\$55 per month.
Sherman		Grocery clerk	\$50 per month.
Fort Worth		Car repairer	\$750 per annum.
Houston		Collector	Commission.
San Antonio		Machinist apprentice	\$10 per week.
McDade		School-teacher	\$60 per month.
Marfa		Assistant railroad agent	Do.
Waco		Stenographer	\$50 per month.
Houston		Street railway conductor	\$55 per month.
Annona		Farmer	
Seabrook		Student	
Denison		Mail weigher	\$3 per diem.
San Marcus			
Texarkana		Cotton sampler	\$50 per month.
Wichita Falls		Farmer	
Somerville		Clerk	\$75 per month.
Denison		Electrician	\$85 per month.
Ledbetter		Farmer	
Henderson		Hotel clerk	
San Antonio		Carpenter	\$3.60 per diem.
Ben Wheeler		Farmer	
Scurry		do	
Denison		Substitute letter carrier	
San Antonio		Porter	\$40 per month.
Myra		Farmer	
Beaumont		Lumber checker	\$15 per week.

CALIFORNIA.

Verdi, Nev.	Sawmill hand.	\$2.75 per day.
Yermo	Clerk	\$20 per week.
Los Angeles	Paper maker	\$100 per month.
do	Conductor	25 cents per hour.
San Francisco	Not employed.	
Oakland	Tracing clerk	\$60 per month.
San Francisco	Realty salesman	\$100 per month.
do	Clerk	\$40 per month.
San Diego	Student	
Pasadena	Dry cleaner	\$18 per week.
Oakland	Ad. compositor	\$4.85 per day.
Redlands	Not employed.	
Los Angeles	Student	
Compton	Draftsman	\$8 per week.
San Francisco	Subclerk, Post Office Department.	\$65 per month.
Richmond	Machinist	40 cents per hour.
Los Angeles	Motorman	\$75 per month.
Stockton	Deliver-wagon driver	\$90 per month.
San Francisco	Clerk	\$50 per month.
Oakland	Lumber clerk	\$3.75 per day.
Dinuba	Contractor	
Alameda	Not employed.	
Los Angeles	Wagon man	\$65 per month.
Tropico	Not employed.	
San Diego	Elevator boy	\$35 per month.
Berkeley	Clerk	
Agnes	Nurse	\$55 per month.
Los Angeles	Shirt cutter	\$15 per week.
Vallejo	Cook	\$80 per month.
Los Angeles	Not employed.	
Oakland	Carpenter	\$5 per day.
Huntington Park	Clerk	\$720 per year.
Sacramento	Upholsterer	\$6 per day.
Los Angeles	Electrician	\$18 per week.
do	Not employed.	
San Fernando	do	
Le Grand	do	
Riverside	Mechanic	\$16 per week.
Eureka	Extra brakeman	\$92 per month.
San Francisco	Express messenger	\$85 per month.
Oakland	Not employed.	
Los Angeles	Rancher	\$25 per month.
do	Packer	\$55 per month.
Oakland	Machinist	\$18 per week.
Fresno	Auto repairing	40 cents per hour.
San Francisco	Real estate business	\$80 per month.
Los Angeles	Carpenter	\$90 per month.
San Francisco	Not employed.	
do	Clerk	\$480 per year.
Sacramento	Conductor	\$3.07 per day.

MISSOURI.

Water Grove	Teacher	\$765 per annum.
La Plata	Clerk in store	\$45 per month.
St. Louis	Cashier and salesman	\$25 per month.
Kansas City	Office clerk	\$14 per week.
Miami	Not employed	
Willston	do	
King City	do	

Railway Mail Service eligibles—Continued.
MISSOURI—continued.

Name.	Address.	Occupation.	Salary.
Kansas City		Correspondent	\$16 per week.
do		Teacher	\$65 per month.
Shrewsbury Park		Heating contractor	No salary.
Winfield		Teacher	\$50 per month.
Humansville		Not employed	
St. Joseph		Clerk	\$60 per month.
Nevada		Student	
Zincite		Teacher	\$70 per month.
Bertrand		do	\$71.50 per month.
St. Louis		Clerk	\$12 per week.
Oregon		do	\$75 per month.
Moberly		Farmer	
Fairfax		Post-office clerk	\$30 per month.
St. Louis		Not employed	
Kansas City		do	
Savannah		Private secretary	\$125 per month.
Cross Timbers		Not employed	
Kansas City		Cigarmaker	\$15 per week.
Joplin		Not employed	
Liberty		Grocery clerk	\$40 per month.
St. Louis		Laundry driver	\$10 per week.
do		Checker	\$50 per month.
Carrollton		Not employed	
Kansas City		Roofing	25 cents per hour.
do		Barber	\$1,000 per year.
Morrison		Telegrapher	\$64.50 per month.
St. Louis		Stenographer	\$32 per month.
Kansas City		Not employed	
do		Machine operator	\$89.25 per month.
do		Orator clerk	\$50 per month.
St. Louis		Clerk	\$15 per week.
Lucerne		Rural carrier	\$88 per month.
Bonne Terre		Not employed	
St. Louis		do	
do		do	
Kansas City		Student	
Unionville		Locomotive fireman	\$85 per month.
St. Louis		Butcher	30 cents per hour.
Kansas City		Lumberman	\$12 per week.
Elvins		Clerk	\$65 per month.
Easton		Farmer	
Kansas City		Meat cutter	\$20 per week.
Springfield		Not employed	
Kansas City		Ticket clerk	\$65 per month.
do		Not employed	

PENNSYLVANIA.

Annville	School-teacher	\$48 per month.
Philadelphia	Salesman	\$20 per week.
Kunkletown	School-teacher	\$50 per month.
Johnstown	Railroad foreman	24 cents per hour.
Danville	Nurse	\$40 per month.
Washington, D. C.	Copyist (department)	\$720 per year.
Kreamer	Baggage porter	\$1.86 per day.
Washington, D. C.	Commercial teacher	\$55 per month.
McKeesport	Unemployed	
Philadelphia	Drafting	\$15 per week.
Easton	Gymnasium director	\$45 per month.
	Young Men's Christian Association.	
Front Run	Unemployed	
Malvern	Carpenter	\$2.50 per day.
Steelton		
Friedensburg	Working at home	
Honey Grove	School-teacher	\$40 per month.
West Milton	do	\$65 per month.
Lost Creek	Clerk	\$660 per year.
Harrisburg	Bookkeeper	\$832 per year.
Lancaster	Bookkeeper and stenographer	\$12 per week.
Llewellyn	School-teacher	\$900 per year.
Lebanon	do	\$45 per month.
Turtle Creek	Clerk	\$660 per year.
Easton	Bookkeeper and stenographer	\$55 per month.
Erie	Shipping clerk	\$50 per month.
do	Clerk and stenographer	Do.
Hegins	School-teacher	\$60 per month.
Pittsburgh	Unemployed	
Lingiestown	Stenographer and clerk	\$58 per month.
Pittsburgh	Railroad clerk	\$60 per month.
Macungie	Ribbon weaver	\$15 per week.
Virginsville	School-teacher	\$50 per month.
Pittsburgh	Unemployed	
Elizabethtown	Bookkeeper	\$40 per month.
Millersburg	Newspaper agent	\$25 per month.
Millersburg	School-teacher	\$40 per month.
Easton	Silk weaver	\$16 per week.
Philadelphia	Mailing clerk	\$14 per week.
do	Unemployed	
do	Clerk	\$10 per week.
do	Baggage man	\$63.60 per month.
Corry	Butter cutter	\$12 per week.
Harrisburg	Salesman	\$20 per week.
Steelton	Student	
Lechburg	Weighman	\$2.25 per day.
Ambridge	Laborer	\$0.166 per hour.
Parkesburg	Tank maker	\$3.50 per day.
Junata	Fire insurance	Independent.
Blue Ridge Summit		
Philadelphia	Salesman	\$15 per week.
Johnstown	Farmer	

Railway Mail Service eligibles—Continued.
PENNSYLVANIA—continued.

Name.	Address.	Occupation.	Salary.
	Pittsburgh	Assistant railroad foreman	\$89.80 per month.
	Philadelphia	Bookkeeper	\$14 per week.
	Stroudsburg	Unemployed	
	Girard	do.	
	Pittsburgh	Clerk	\$65 per month.

Departmental clerk eligibles.
PENNSYLVANIA.

Name.	Address.	Occupation.	Salary.
	Reading	Substitute clerk (post office)	35 cents per hour.
	Washington, D. C.	Student	
	do.	Editor and manager	\$1,200 per annum.
	Franklin	Teacher	\$2 per diem.
	Forest City	Teacher	
	Philadelphia	Painter	\$65 per month.
	Washington, D. C.	Painter	\$2 per day.
	Royersford	do.	25 cents per hour.
	Robesonia	Teacher	\$85 per month.
	Wernersville	do.	\$55 per month.
	Lehigh	Clerk	\$12.50 per week.
	Camden, N. J.	Teacher	
	Trescow	do.	
	Burgettstown	do.	
	Washington, D. C.	Messenger (War Department)	\$660 per annum.
	Woodbury	do.	
	Washington, D. C.	Teacher	\$40 per month.
	Chicora	Clerk (post office)	\$890 per annum.
	Sassamansville	Shipper	\$9 per week.
	West Reading	Student	
	Philadelphia	Clerk (Bureau of Light-houses)	\$1,000 per annum.
	Shoemakersville	do.	
	Washington, D. C.	Laborer	
	do.	Teacher	\$50 per month.
	McAllisterville	Clerk	\$7.50 per week.
	Terre Hill	do.	\$14 per week.
	Philadelphia	Substitute letter carrier	35 cents per hour.
	Altoona	Clerk	\$57.70 per month.
	Tamaqua	Student	
	Philadelphia	Unemployed	
	Wilmer	Engineer	\$65 per month.
	Lewisburg	Laborer	\$1.50 per day.
	Kulpmont	Unemployed	
	Ercildown	Working for brother	
	Jackson Center	Teacher	\$55 per month.
	Norristown	Salesman	\$15 per week.
	Hastings	Student	
	Youngsville	Bookkeeper	\$45 per month.
	West Point	Student	
	Olean	Knitter	\$15 per week.
	Northpoint	Clerk	\$27 per month.
	Rea ling	Atheletic instructor	\$620 per year.
	Philadelphia	School-teacher	
	Scranton	Student	
	Prospect	Clerk	\$12 per week.
	Harrisburg	Grocery clerk	\$8 per week.
	Pittsburgh	School-teacher	\$50 per month.
	Philadelphia	do.	\$55 per month.
	Port Trenorton	do.	\$100 per month.
	Fogelsville	Cost clerk	\$12 per week.
	New Brighton	Department clerk	\$900 per year.
	Philadelphia	Department messenger	\$540 per year.
	Washington, D. C.	Letter carrier	30 cents to 40 cents per hour.
	do.		
	do.		

CALIFORNIA.

	Elsinore	Student	
	Santa Clara	Messenger	\$720 (departmental).

MISSOURI.

	St. Joseph	Clerk	\$900, field service.
	Kansas City	Collector	\$520, field service.
	St. Louis	Student	
	Washington, D. C.	Manager and owner stock farm	
	Edgar Springs	do.	
	Springfield	Student	
	Kansas City	Assistant preacher	\$50 per month.
	do.	do.	
	1318 Rhode Island Avenue NW	Farmer	
	Washington, D. C.	Assistant messenger	\$720 (departmental).
	Caledonia	do.	
	1202 Staples Street, N.E., Washington, D. C.	Clerk	\$45 per month.
	Kansas City	Musician	\$10 per week.
	Maryville	Clerk	\$45 per month.
	Kansas City		

Departmental clerk eligibles—Continued.
TEXAS.

Name.	Address.	Occupation.	Salary.
	Texarkana	Teacher	\$1,000 per annum.
	Murchison	do.	\$70 per month.
	Cicero	do.	\$70 per month.
	Forth Worth	Manager-clerk	\$15 per week.
	San Antonio	Student	
	Sabinal	do.	
	Tyler	Tax assessor	
	Commerce	Teacher	\$35 per month.
	San Antonio	Sales manager	\$80 per month.
	Austin	Student	
	Kirkland	Teacher	\$1,000 per annum.
	Weatherford	Student	
	Sealy	Bookkeeper	\$60 per month.
	Sherman	Student	
	Whitewright	Reporter	\$60 per month.
	Washington, D. C.	Messenger	\$660 (departmental).
	Moody	Farmer	

IDAHO.

	Boise	Bank custodian	\$900 per annum.
--	-------	----------------	------------------

UTAH.

	Ogden	Unemployed	
--	-------	------------	--

OREGON.

	Fresno, Cal.	Photographer	\$20 per week.
	Washington, D. C.	Clerk (mail, weighing division, Post Office Department)	\$900 per annum.
	Portland	Clerk (Wells-Fargo)	\$40 per month.

WASHINGTON.

	North Yakima	Internal, Revenue Department, storekeeper	\$3 per diem.
	Washington, D. C.	Assistant librarian (George Washington University)	
	Orting	Notary public	\$600 to \$2,400 per annum.
	Tacoma	Newspaper circulating manager	\$400 per annum.
	Seattle	Solicitor	
	Washington, D. C.	Student	

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, I ask permission to proceed for 10 minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to proceed for 10 minutes. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. MADDEN. Mr. Chairman, the men who enter the Postal Service in the class of employment provided for in the section to which the gentleman has just referred do so through the passage of an examination. After passing the examination they are appointed as substitute clerks or carriers. As a substitute every man is obliged to report every day for duty for a period of not less than three years on an average. During his period of substitute service he may report every day for a week without obtaining any employment, and every day that he is obliged to report, if he lives in a large city where he lives any distance away from his employment, he must pay car fare back and forth. The average compensation earned by these men during their period of substitute service is about \$400 a year. After they are appointed regularly they begin at \$800, and if the record of the man justifies it at the end of another year he gets \$900, and then at the end of another year he gets \$1,000, and at the end of another year \$1,100, and it has been the policy of Congress to appropriate for 75 per cent of the men in the \$1,100 grade to go to \$1,200 in first-class offices and in the second-class offices it has been the policy to appropriate for 75 per cent of the men to go to \$1,100, and the average compensation earned by those men in the first nine years of their service, including their substitute service, amounts to \$742 a year, not a very large sum. During all the period of their employment in the Postal Service they are obliged to give from two to three hours of their time without pay after they have done their day's work to the study of schemes which will enable them to distribute the mail. They distribute to every section of the Union. When a man has studied a scheme and committed it to memory, covering a county, he is compelled then to take on a new county and so on until they study a scheme for an entire State, and ultimately he is obliged to have memorized every post office in the United States in order that he

may be able to perform the functions of the office to which he has been appointed.

I submit that this is not ordinary employment. It is extraordinary employment. It is an employment that requires tenacity of purpose, it requires physical force, it requires mental ability, it requires patriotism, and, after all, with all these studies, these men are required to work 8 hours within 10 hours of a single day. They are required to be on call for 10 hours, during a period of which they are obliged to work 8 hours. They are not only obliged to work for that length of time, but 70 per cent of all the work of the men in the department is night work. They are obliged to work under artificial light. They never see the sunlight. During years of service these men are hidden away in the darkness of these great post-office buildings, working under artificial light. Many of them lose their eyesight as the result of their service. They become proficient in the work in which they are employed and they lose knowledge that is of any use to them in any commercial pursuit outside of the post office. They are valuable to the Government of the United States on account of their long experience, and they are of no value whatever to themselves in any other work whatever. And it is because of the fact that they learn nothing in their employment that makes them useful in the commercial life of the Nation that the Government of the United States ought to give more consideration to them than it has given in the past. The law of 1907 provided for the compensation which is carried in this section of the bill. It left the matter of promotions discretionary with the Congress. The Congress has not exercised that discretion until within the last year; then for the first time it exercised the discretion to the extent of 5 per cent promotions of the men from \$1,200 to \$1,300 and from \$1,300 to \$1,400 in the first-class post offices; and for the first time since the enactment of the classification act, in 1907, last year it exercised the discretion which the law gave to it to promote 5 per cent of the men from \$1,100 to \$1,200 a year in second-class offices. This provision of the bill is not only just but it is humanitarian. It ought to go further, and it would be more just if it went further. We are conferring no favors on the men who are to receive the salaries provided for in this section of the bill.

Mr. BLACK. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes, sir.

Mr. BLACK. You stated the section of the bill last year provided for a portion of 5 per cent in second-class offices from \$1,100 to \$1,200 and 5 per cent from \$1,200 to \$1,300 in first-class offices. That provision that is incorporated in the bill provides this year for a 25 per cent promotion as to these respective classes?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes, sir; that is what it does. I believe it ought to go further. I believe that all the men in the \$1,200 grade who are entitled to promotion ought to go to \$1,300. Instead of 25 per cent of them, I believe all the men in the \$1,300 grade ought to go to \$1,400.

Mr. GORDON. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MADDEN. Yes.

Mr. GORDON. You have introduced a bill that raises everybody that is getting \$1,200 to \$1,500, have you not?

Mr. MADDEN. I have introduced the bill which reclassifies the men in the Postal Service, and I believe that if that bill could be enacted into law it would be beneficial to the Postal Service.

Mr. GORDON. Answer the question. Does not your bill provide for raising all the \$1,200 carriers to \$1,500?

Mr. MADDEN. It provides that the men shall enter the service, when they become regularly appointed, at \$1,000; that they shall go automatically to \$1,100, \$1,200, \$1,300, \$1,400, and \$1,500, and I believe the compensation provided in that bill is just and reasonable. It is justified by the work they do.

We ought to popularize the Postal Service. It reaches every home in the land. The American people think of the Post Office service as the most popular service in America. They have confidence in the men who carry the mail, confidence in the men who distribute the mail. There is no more patriotic class of men in America than the men who are employed in the Postal Service. They are entitled to the best consideration that the Government can give, and I regret that this item does not carry more recognition of the merit of these men than is provided in the section now under discussion. I believe the item is meritorious, because it does long-deferred justice to a patriotic class of men who, in season and out of season, have uncomplainingly responded to the call of duty. These men never grumble. They are on guard all the time. They are ready to give everything there is in them to the Government service and to popularize the postal branch of the Government to such an

extent that everybody in the United States will say "All hail to the men of the Postal Service." [Applause.]

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired.

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I agree with all that my colleague on the committee [Mr. MADDEN] has said in relation to this amendment. I believe it is a just one, and I believe it does one thing that should be done in every branch of the Federal service, in that it wipes out the preferential class, those who may have power enough, those who may have friendship enough, with the ones who are to control the promotion in the different branches of the service. And that is accomplished in this bill, Mr. Chairman. Now, the question has been brought up here about the comparison of the service rendered with that of private capital. Mr. Chairman, there is no comparison. When a man enters the service of the Post Office Department of the Government of the United States, and after he has once reached the maximum wage, he can never go higher. He can never advance. He is there, if he stays in the service, for all time, or until Congress sees fit to raise the maximum wage.

Comparison has been made by my colleague from Indiana [Mr. COX] as to the amount of wage he receives when he enters the service. He says the average entrance salary of those who apply for service in the Government is \$1.50 a day.

Mr. COX. The gentleman wants to quote me right. I said it ranges from \$1.50 a day to approximately \$15 a week.

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I will make the correction. He said from \$1.50 a day to \$15 a week. The men entering the service are young men, from the ages of 18 to 21, just starting out in life. He neglected to bring out the point that these men are ready to labor and to labor earnestly, that they are obliged to pass a physical as well as a mental examination, and then give a test during the entire service in the Government employ that would never be requested or exacted of them by any private employer.

Where is there a private employer who will take his employees and compel them to take home, night after night, tests, as the men in the Post Office Service are required to do? Where is there an employer who will register the work of those men upon tests that they are compelled to make in their own time?

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAGUE. Yes.

Mr. GORDON. Do you think these post-office employees are required to submit to a higher test than the school-teachers?

Mr. TAGUE. Yes, Mr. Chairman; I assert that the men who work in the post offices are required to undergo tests more severe than are imposed upon those who are required to labor in private employment, no matter what it is.

Mr. MEEKER. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. TAGUE. Yes.

Mr. MEEKER. Does not the gentleman think that the salaries that are paid to the public-school teachers are a national disgrace?

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I do not know what they pay in the gentleman's city, but we took from the gentleman's State of Ohio a man who was drawing a salary of \$5,000, and in our city we pay him a salary of \$10,000 a year.

Mr. COX. Does the gentleman know that the average salary paid to school-teachers in the State of Massachusetts is \$456 a year?

Mr. TAGUE. No. I am not ready to believe that until it is shown to me in figures, and round figures.

Mr. FESS. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. TAGUE. In a moment. I know this much, Mr. Chairman, that in the city which I have the honor to represent in part the average wage of the school-teacher is nearer \$900 than \$456.

Mr. COX. I am taking the average for the State of Massachusetts. If the gentleman will read the Record of December 21 he will find a bulletin put in the Record of that date concerning the salaries paid to school-teachers in his own State.

Mr. FESS. If the school boards fail to recognize the service of school-teachers, is that a reason why the Government should fail to recognize the services of its employees?

Mr. TAGUE. No. That is one instance where the Government does not give sufficient recognition to the value of the services of those who faithfully perform their duties, and there is no class of people who perform more faithful and honorable duties to the public than do the school-teachers. I am ready to vote to that class of our public servants the same as I am ready to do in the case of the employees in the Postal Service. I would give to them a deserved wage, and a wage which they should receive from the date of their entrance. [Applause.]

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, all debate under the rule on this section, as I understand it, is exhausted. I call for a vote.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last two words.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York moves to strike out the last two words.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Chairman, I hope that the amendment suggested by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox] will not prevail. These salaries are not too large, and then I think the gentleman has overlooked—

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, did the Chair rule on the point made?

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York offered an amendment to the amendment, by moving to strike out the last two words.

Mr. MOON. Oh, very well, if he offered an amendment.

Mr. BENNET. As I was about to say, Mr. Chairman, these salaries of themselves are not too large, and I feel sure that the majority of the committee will vote down the amendment suggested by the gentleman from Indiana. I think that he feels that way also. I give him the credit of having a goodness of heart which he sometimes successfully conceals [laughter], and I feel that he will really not feel badly if we vote him down.

Mr. COX. I want to say to the gentleman that I am sincere in this amendment. I do not want the Members of the House to have any other idea.

Mr. BENNET. The gentleman is sincere, but sometimes his real tenderness of heart enables him to withstand with equanimity the defeat of an amendment of that kind. [Laughter.] Not only is the section itself right, but it is necessary, because—

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman—

The CHAIRMAN. For what purpose does the gentleman from Tennessee rise?

Mr. MOON. I just want to make the point of order that the gentleman is not speaking to his amendment.

Mr. BENNET. Oh, yes; I am.

Mr. MOON. I will leave it to the Chair to decide.

Mr. BENNET. And I leave it to the Chair. [Laughter.]

Mr. MOON. The gentleman's amendment was to strike out the last two words. Let us have the debate on the last two words, then.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York will proceed.

Mr. BENNET. The last two words, Mr. Chairman, as I am told, are the words "as follows." I desire to speak two or three moments on the words "as follows." The word "follows" is a very important word. As I started to say to the gentleman from Indiana and to the committee, the really important thing about this section is what follows. [Laughter.] What does follow? I will tell you what follows.

Mr. MOON. Does not the gentleman think the important thing about this matter is the last two words, "as not"? That is the gentleman's amendment.

Mr. BENNET. Some one told me that my amendment was to strike out the words "as follows." [Laughter.]

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent to have the amendment of the gentleman from Indiana reported again.

Mr. BENNET. And I ask to have my amendment again reported.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York may proceed for five minutes. I do not want this rule violated and the debate extended beyond five minutes.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will state that, as it is well known, under general debate the Member entitled to the floor is permitted to discuss any subject he sees fit to discuss under the rules of the House. Under the five-minute rule there can be allowed one speech in favor of the amendment and one against the amendment, and under the five-minute rule the Member must confine himself to the amendment pending before the committee.

The Chair can do nothing except call the attention of the membership to the rules of the House and to ask the Members to observe those rules. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. Moon] asks unanimous consent that the gentleman from New York [Mr. BENNET] be permitted to address the committee for five minutes. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. BENNET. I thank the committee. As I was about to say when I was struggling with some difficulty to ascertain what my amendment was, the important part of the whole situation is what follows after an employee runs up the ladder on this particular provision. This provision applies to special clerks and salaries up to \$1,400. In and above \$1,200 are what are known as the supervisory grades, and without at all miti-

gating my friendship for the grades below the \$1,200 grade, I want to call attention to the fact that if you do not keep this provision in, you close the door of hope for ultimate promotion to every clerk below the \$1,200 grade, and you deprive the clerks who are to be promoted here from enjoying their opportunity for ultimate promotion above \$1,200.

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNET. Certainly.

Mr. COX. Does not the gentleman know that these employees are automatically promoted, \$100 a year until they get to \$1,000, one class of them, those who work in the second-class post offices, and those who work in the first-class post offices are automatically promoted until they get to \$1,100, and the whole body of them are gradually promoted in that way?

Mr. BENNET. I do not think the 75 per cent part is in the classification act.

Mr. COX. Of course it is in the classification act.

Mr. BENNET. I was not aware of it. But that has nothing to do with what I was calling attention to, and that is the absolute lack of attention that is given to fairness, decency, and justice in connection with the salaries in the supervisory grades above \$1,200. I come from a large city, in which there are many of these men who occupy positions where they literally handle millions for \$1,300 and \$1,400 in salaries, a service for which, if they were working for the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], who is known to be an employer of high-priced men, they would receive as their pay anywhere from \$2,000 to \$5,000. If these men are not promoted from \$1,200 to \$1,300 and from \$1,300 to \$1,400, you cut off all chance for promotion. There has not been half enough done in any year for the supervisory force in any of the large post offices, and we are leaving the large administration of the greater affairs of our post offices throughout the land to the fidelity, which is seldom abused, of men who stay in the service, where they are underpaid, far more underpaid, than in any other branch of the Postal Service.

I realize that this will not be an entirely popular speech with my friends, the letter carriers, and the clerks who get anywhere from \$800 to \$1,200. But I will have to take a chance on that. I am in favor of increasing them, too, and always have been; but no one up to this time—possibly because the supervisory employees are few—has laid their case before the House, excepting the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. MADDEN], while I was out of Congress, and I had forgotten that for the moment. As representing in part the largest postal city of this country, I want to say frankly to the House of Representatives that however we may reasonably and honestly differ, and we do, as to the compensation paid to men receiving \$1,200 or less, for the kind of positions that these clerks are promoted to fill from these grades of special clerks at \$1,200, \$1,300, and \$1,400 a year, the pay that they get for the work they do as compared with what men get for similar work outside, is a disgrace to the Government of the United States; and there is no Government that I dare mention in public with which we can compare our conduct.

The CHAIRMAN. The time of the gentleman has expired. The question is on the amendment offered by the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox].

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. Cox) there were—ayes 7, noes 68.

Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

And provided further, That hereafter when the needs of the service require the employment on holidays of "special clerks" in first and second class post offices, they shall be allowed compensatory time on one of the 30 days next following the holiday on which they perform such service.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois: Page 11, line 26, insert: "Provided, That when emergencies or the needs of the service require letter carriers in the City Delivery Service and clerks and special clerks in first and second class post offices to work in excess of eight hours a day, for such additional services they shall be paid at a rate of 50 per centum higher than their salaries as fixed by law."

Mr. COX. I reserve a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I do not believe the point of order would be well taken against this amendment. The Congress has passed laws for the purpose of creating an eight-hour day. This amendment is for the purpose of having that eight-hour day applied. The effect is to stop unnecessary overtime work by employees. I maintain that this will not increase the expenditure of the Government, but perhaps it will reduce it, because when you permit men to work 10, 12,

and 14 hours it does not tend to efficiency of workmanship, and is a poor business method.

Mr. CHAIRMAN, the fact is that this will add to the efficiency of the service of the Post Office Department, for the reason that it can be shown that unnecessary overtime work decreases efficiency. I do not care much about the emergency part of it, if it is an emergency; but unfortunately the Post Office Department has seemed to desire to practice that sort of economy which presses down the hardest on the back of the man who is the hardest worked and the poorest paid.

Mr. BLACK. Will the gentleman yield for a question?

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Yes.

Mr. BLACK. Can the gentleman cite a single instance during the present Democratic administration where the salary of a single postal employee has been reduced?

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. I was not talking about their salaries being reduced. I was talking about their being overworked and speeded up; and there are instances where they have been reduced, for that matter. I can not name them, but I can recall this to the mind of the gentleman, that in the first session of this Congress we passed a resolution to restore to their positions—that is, from \$1,100 to \$1,200—post-office collectors who had been reduced by the Postmaster General. There can be hundreds of cases cited. I do not happen to have them at hand.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. In regard to the question of the gentleman from Texas (Mr. BLACK), there was called to my attention not long ago the case of an old gentleman who had been working in the Post Office Department for 25 years as a mail clerk, whose salary had been reduced from \$1,400 to \$1,200 a year.

Mr. BLACK. Will the gentleman yield there?

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. If I can get my time extended I will yield; yes.

Mr. BLACK. I want to ask the gentleman from Ohio if he knows anything about the administrative reasons for that reduction in salary?

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. It seems that the old gentleman whom I spoke of could not pass a certain examination that the department required him to take. Therefore, after being in the service for 25 years, they reduced his salary \$200 a year.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Yes.

Mr. MOON. I do not like the suggestion in the question of the gentleman from Ohio, that the department has reduced improperly the salary of any man. Evidently the case the gentleman has referred to is the case of an inefficient clerk who had passed the period of life where he was of no value to the service. It might have been proper to dismiss him, and it was a mercy to reduce his salary.

Mr. COOPER of Ohio. Does the gentleman think that the Government ought to throw a man into the scrap pile after he has served 25 years?

Mr. MOON. It is not a question of the salary that we should give him, it is a question of discipline and the efficiency of the service, and it is nonsense to talk about reducing his salary when he has passed the period of efficiency.

[The time of Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois having expired, he was granted 5 minutes more.]

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I do not desire to challenge the motive of any Member of Congress or any official of the administration, but those who are exercising their efforts to keep the Government employees from receiving an adequate wage, and especially those who prevent the laws being applied that have been passed by this Congress, such as the eight-hour-a-day law, which was passed for the purpose of securing an eight-hour day, ought not to succeed. We ought not to permit any department of the Government to employ men over eight hours, not even for economy, except in cases of emergency. On the question of the eight-hour day I would like to call your attention to what the President of the United States says, and while it is true that this was said some time before the last election and he may lose interest in regard to this matter at this time, and I doubt if he would if he understood the administration of the Post Office Department, yet this is what he said:

We believe in the eight-hour law because a man does better work within eight hours than he does within a more extended day, and the whole theory of it, a theory which is sustained by abundant experience, is that his efficiency is increased, his spirit in his work has improved, and the whole moral and physical vigor of the man is added to.

This amendment that I have offered is for the purpose of securing the application of the eight-hour day, and instead of working postal employees overtime—which they are opposed to—they could put the substitutes to work, which would give them a greater income and would be beneficial both to the reg-

ular employees of the Postal Service as well as to the substitutes. Therefore I contend that this is an important amendment and should be adopted by the House. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The extension of remarks is as follows:

WASHINGTON, D. C., January 9, 1916.

HON. FRANK BUCHANAN, M. C.,

Washington, D. C.

MY DEAR MR. BUCHANAN: I wish to enlist your support of an amendment to the postal appropriation bill which has for its purpose the minimizing of overtime work for clerks, special clerks, and city letter carriers, and giving these Government employees the benefit of the eight-hour law enacted by Congress August 24, 1912.

The amendment embodies the same idea as that contained in your bill (H. R. 19293). It proposes to establish a wage scale of time and a half for all work in excess of eight hours, solely for the purpose—and I wish to emphasize this—of eliminating unnecessary overtime.

Under no circumstances should this amendment be confused with the salary-increase agitation. It is not an effort to obtain additional wages by increasing the rate of overtime pay; it is an effort to confine the day's work in post offices to eight hours by fixing a penalty for work in excess of that period.

Existing law provides that overtime work be paid at a proportionate rate of the daily wage. In many instances this rate is lower than that for substitute and auxiliary clerks and carriers. As a result the regular clerks and carriers are forced to work overtime while the substitutes are deprived of work which is rightfully theirs. This injustice would be corrected by establishing a wage rate of time and a half for all regular clerks and carriers for work in excess of eight hours. The department would then restrict overtime to actual emergencies, which the law originally contemplated, and the regulars and substitutes would both be benefited.

The following editorial in the July, 1916, issue of the Union Postal Clerk, states the facts on the subject of overtime:

"Just as we fought for our eight-hour law, the antigag law, the workmen's compensation law, and now for retirement, so will we strive to confine, as far as practical, the day's work for every clerk in the service within eight hours.

The necessity for a wage differential in favor of overtime work is apparent in offices like Chicago and Cleveland, where periodically the regular clerks are forced to toll excessively long hours. Apparently, in the absence of having to pay the penalty of a higher wage rate, the department prefers to work its distributors overtime rather than employ an adequate substitute force. This operates to the disadvantage of both classes of employees—one is compelled to work too long and the other gets little or no work. A higher rate of pay for overtime would insure the regular clerk an eight-hour day and insure the substitute a larger and steadier income. Both classes of employees would benefit and the service efficiency would be improved.

"Until a premium is put on overtime the temptation to work the expert clerks excessively long hours will always be present. It is unjust to penalize a man for his expertness; yet that is what is done when skilled distributors are kept at their tasks for more than eight hours. But there is no use for us to moralize about the injustice of it. Neither does it profit us to argue that a man's efficiency wanes after eight hours of mail distribution. The boss would rather have a tired regular at 40 cents than a sub at 35 cents an hour. If, however, he must pay the regular 60 cents—almost the price of two subs—then the regular will go home on time and the sub will get the emergency work to which he is rightfully entitled.

"When we make overtime expensive it will cease. A 50 per cent wage differential for work in excess of eight hours will minimize this service and insure an eight-hour day to the clerks. The fight for it is on!"

An editorial in the November issue of the same paper cites the deplorable conditions existing then, and still existing, in the Chicago office:

"Damaging proof of the baneful effects of overtime on postal workers is shown in the increased sick benefits paid by the Chicago Post Office Clerks' Union during those periods when the department forces its clerks to work extra hours.

"Taking the month of March, 1915, as an example, we find that the Chicago union paid approximately \$450 in sick benefits. The overtime for that month amounted to 50 hours. In March, 1916, with 65 hours' overtime, the sick benefits totaled \$590.

"These financial statements of the Chicago union are the best barometer of office working conditions. When conditions are normal sick benefit payments drop to a minimum, but when the speeding up and the extra hours of duty are added the clerks break under the strain, requiring enforced lay-offs and medical attention to recuperate.

"Mr. Koons, First Assistant Postmaster General by the exigencies of politics, has dismissed the complaint of the Chicago clerks as of no consequence. 'It is just another attack on the department by Flaherty,' is his retort.

"If he would take his eyes off the departmental balance sheet and his mind off the expected surplus long enough to examine the Chicago mailing division time sheets and the union's sick-benefit payments he might realize the seriousness of our overtime complaint. He would find that he, a political adjunct of an administration that is seeking vindication at the polls largely on its labor legislative record, is denying, because of indifference or stupidity, an eight-hour day to at least 1,000 clerks in Chicago and thousands in other large offices.

"While the Chicago situation is most aggravated, a similar condition exists in many other offices. We find the harassed, overworked, speeded distributors being driven to physical exhaustion by as hard and implacable a set of administrative taskmasters as was ever given temporary authority over humans."

SOUGHT AID OF PRESIDENT.

The excessive amount of overtime demanded of the postal employees was so great and the complaints so widespread that I, realizing the futility of further appeals to the department, addressed an open letter to President Wilson, under date of October 6, 1916, asking his aid in bringing relief from the intolerable condition. The letter follows:

"DEAR SIR: After fruitless efforts to have the officials of the Postal Department relieve thousands of post-office clerks of excessive overtime service, I am making this appeal to you.

"The working hours of post-office clerks are governed by a law passed by the Sixty-second Congress on August 24, 1912, which provides in substance that clerks in first and second class post offices shall be required to work not more than 8 hours a day within 10 hours, and for work in excess of 8 hours a day within 10 hours, and for work in excess of 8 hours, they are paid in proportion to their salaries as fixed by law.

"This law contemplated that only in emergencies should more than 8 hours be required. Yet in many of the large post offices, notably New York, Chicago, Boston, Cleveland, etc., the clerks are forced daily and nightly to work 10, 11, and even 12 hours.

"One need not, I am sure, point out to the injustice of this. You very happily expressed yourself on this subject in a recent speech to a gathering of New Jersey business men, saying: 'We believe in the eight-hour law because a man does better work within eight hours than he does within a more extended day, and the whole theory of it, a theory which is sustained now by abundant experience, is that his efficiency is increased, his spirit in his work has improved, and the whole moral and physical vigor of the man is added to.'

"These words have a direct application to a post-office mail distributor. He works mostly at night, at top speed, at high tension, performing an important work requiring constant vigilance. To compel long hours of overtime service from this class of workers is inhumane; it is also poor business policy, resulting in errors in distribution when the overtaxed brain refuses to respond and in the physical breakdown of the worker.

"In the Chicago post office alone, 800 clerks have averaged 105 hours overtime during the first six months of this year. The bulk of this was crowded into the last four months of that period. Since July the conditions have grown steadily worse, until at the present time, with the prelection and the usual heavy fall mailings in full swing, thousands of clerks are complaining of their hardships.

"The responsible department officials are seemingly indifferent to the plight of the clerks. The remedy is within their hands to apply if they so desire. The current appropriation measure for the Postal Service made possible the appointment of 1,300 additional clerks. Despite the boasted gain in receipts and the ever-increasing volume of work, but few of these appointments have been made. Postmasters are clamoring for help, the clerks are longing for relief, and yet the department officials refuse to recognize the need of keeping the working force recruited to an efficient working standard.

"If possible I ask you to have an investigation made, independent of the Postal Department's influence, of the working conditions of the clerks in the post offices I have mentioned. While no reasonable objection can be made to overtime work in the Postal Service when actual emergencies exist, there is very strong objection to the habitual violation of the spirit of a law designed to give to post-office clerks the benefits of an eight-hour day. Your investigation will disclose a condition to which I know you are opposed. The Postal Department officials have placed you in the untenable position of advocating a principle in private employment—the eight-hour day—which is not in effect in Government employment, solely because of a desire for a greater postal surplus.

"Asking you to take action to relieve the post-office clerks of this intolerable, undesired, and arduous overtime service which is sapping the strength and vitality of thousands of faithful, trained service experts, I am,

Respectfully, yours,

THOS. F. FLAHERTY,
"Secretary-Treasurer."

SECOND PROTEST SENT.

My letter to the President was referred to the Postmaster General, but no noticeable effort was made to correct the abuses of which the complaint was made. Under date of October 24 I again wrote the President:

"President WOODROW WILSON,
Asbury Park, N. J.

"DEAR SIR: With further reference to my letter to you of October 6, receipt of which was acknowledged October 8, I have to inform you that the Postmaster General, to whom my letter was referred, has made no noticeable effort to correct the abuses to which I called your attention, namely, the additional hours of labor forced upon post-office distributors in violation of the spirit of our eight-hour law and in contravention of your own admirable views on the advantages of confining the workday to eight hours.

"The post-office distributors in many of the larger offices are compelled to work excessively long hours under exceedingly trying conditions, frequently at night and always at high tension. This overtime work imposed upon these men is due entirely, I insist, to the unwillingness of the Postal Department officials, because of a mistaken zeal for a larger postal surplus, to recruit the clerical force up to a proper standard.

"Congress has made it possible for the department to increase the clerical force of the service by the appointment of 1,300 additional clerks, yet, despite the obvious need of augmenting the force before the holiday rush, less than half of this number have been appointed.

"I again respectfully urge you to make an investigation independent of the Postal Department officials, who have been aware of these conditions for months but have failed to act. An examination of the time sheets of the New York, Chicago, Boston, Philadelphia, Cleveland, Memphis, and many other offices will impel you, I think, in view of your stand on the eight-hour-day principle, to insist upon the administrative officials of the Postal Department correcting this grievance by confining overtime for distributors to actual emergencies.

Respectfully, yours,

THOS. F. FLAHERTY,
"Secretary-Treasurer."

ANOTHER APPEAL TO THE DEPARTMENT.

In a memorial submitted to the Postal Department on November 15, 1916, the executive committee of the National Federation of Post Office Clerks asked that unnecessary overtime be eliminated and suggested the establishment of a higher wage rate for work in excess of eight hours as the surest preventive of overtime. The memorial reads:

OVERTIME.

"Due to the recent rapid expansion of the Postal Service and to the failure of the department to recruit its clerical force to the proper strength, thousands of clerks, especially distributors, are forced to work excessively long hours. While it is true these men receive overtime pay, prorated according to their salaries, it is equally true that they prefer a straight eight-hour day, except only in emergencies. To force men to work in excess of eight hours day after day is contrary to the letter and spirit of our eight-hour law.

"Inasmuch as distributors must devote time after working hours to scheme study, it necessarily follows that excessive overtime works to the disadvantage of the service in interfering with the study of the clerks and also works to the disadvantage of the clerks in subjecting them to penalties for failing to qualify on scheme examinations when there is no time for preparation.

"We heartily indorse the declaration of President Wilson made in reference to this subject. 'We believe in the eight-hour law because a man does better work within eight hours than he does within a more extended day, and the whole theory of it, a theory which is sustained now by abundant experience, is that his efficiency is increased, his spirit in his work is improved, and the whole moral and physical vigor of the man is added to.'

"These words have a direct application to a post-office mail distributor. He works mostly at night, at top speed, at high tension, performing an important work requiring constant vigilance. To compel long hours of overtime service from this class of workers is inhumane; it is also poor business policy, resulting in errors in distribution when the overtaxed brain refuses to respond and in the physical breakdown of the worker.

"We ask the department to issue explicit instructions to postmasters to observe the letter and spirit of the eight-hour law by confining overtime to actual emergencies.

EXTRA PAY FOR OVERTIME.

"We believe that in order to insure the proper administration of our eight-hour law, there should be a penalty for all work in excess of eight hours in the form of added compensation. This is not an attempt to secure an additional wage, but rather an effort to insure an eight-hour day. Under the present law it is less costly to require extra service of the regular employees than to put on auxiliary men, thus working a hardship on both classes of employees—the substitutes and the regulars. If extra compensation had to be paid to the regular men, there would be less disposition to work them overtime. We therefore urge the establishment of a time-and-a-half rate of pay for all work in excess of eight hours."

You will see from the foregoing that we have made every effort to minimize overtime service and to confine it to actual emergencies, but seemingly without success. In practically all of the large post offices the regular clerical force, especially the distributors, are at this time working in excess of eight hours. We feel this condition will continue to exist unless the Congress enacts the legislation embodied in this amendment—the establishment of a higher rate for overtime service.

Asking your earnest cooperation in this attempt to insure to the postal workers the benefits of an eight-hour workday, I am,

Very truly, yours,

THOS. F. FLAHERTY.

Secretary-Treasurer National Federation of Post Office Clerks.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, the point of order has been reserved, and I ask that the amendment be again read.

The amendment was again reported.

Mr. MOON. I think, Mr. Chairman, that is subject to the point of order.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. I would like to ask the gentleman on what ground?

Mr. MOON. Because it changes existing law.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. In what way?

Mr. MOON. If it does not change it, why does the gentleman want it?

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. It only provides for overtime pay.

Mr. MOON. Yes; it is an increase of salary; and, then, again, it is not germane to this section.

Mr. COX. I make the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment in question changes existing law in that it increases the pay of the employees working in excess of eight hours. It is not in order on an appropriation bill, and therefore the Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word. I want to inquire of the chairman of the committee if under the compensatory provision it was ever intended that a man who takes this time should be made in reality to perform an equivalent amount of service in some other way. Let me illustrate. I have been informed by carriers in my home office at Atlanta, for instance, they work on Sunday or a holiday, and the superintendent of mails comes and says you take your compensatory time on such and such a day. He takes that time, but instead of employing a substitute, an extra man, which I understand the law intended, they divide the route of this man up among two or three different carriers and make them perform the service. He goes back to work the next day, and one of the others is designated for his compensatory time, and the man off the day before will perform extra service. In reality, if the law is administered in every post office in this country as it has been in the city of Atlanta, the compensatory time provision in the postal laws has been absolutely nullified by the administration features imposed in this office by the superintendent of mails, probably without the permission of the postmaster.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. HOWARD] must know that the chairman of the committee does not know whether the law has been violated in Georgia or not.

Mr. HOWARD. I do not mean that. I meant to ask the gentleman, so that I could get it into the Record, whether or not he had any information in respect to the matter. He has been so long upon the committee and is so familiar with this legislation that I wanted an expression from him as to whether

or not the framers of that law ever intended that men who received compensatory time for working on Sundays and holidays should in reality pay it back to the Government by extra service.

Mr. MOON. The intention of the law was that they should have exactly what is provided; that when they did work for a specific time they should have compensatory time therefor. That I understand has been the policy of the administration. That is the regulation of the department and the intention of the law, and I presume it has been carried out.

Mr. HOWARD. Mr. Chairman, my object in making this observation at this point was to call the attention of Congress to the fact that of my own knowledge, obtained from reliable men in the service, that law has been violated and is being violated, and I do not say that it is being violated with the knowledge of the executive heads in the city of Washington; but I know that men who receive compensatory time in the office in the city of Atlanta are made to really repay that to the Government in extra services performed instead of their employing substitutes.

Mr. MOON. If the gentleman or any of his constituents are having trouble along that line, it is purely a matter of administration and should be referred to the department at Washington, for it is not a question for legislation.

The Clerk read as follows:

For compensation to printers, mechanics, and skilled laborers, 22, at \$1,200 each; 4, at \$1,100 each; and 31, at \$1,000 each; in all, \$61,800.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend by inserting, after the word "holidays," the words "or holy days," on page 11, line 23.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amend, on page 11, line 23, by inserting, after the word "holidays," the words "or holy days."

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, on that I reserve the point of order.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Chairman, I want to ask the chairman of the committee a question. In the large cities there are a number of clerks of the Jewish or Hebraic people, who have certain holy days like Yom Kippur and others, which days they observe strictly. By the necessities of the service some of them are required to work on their holy days, and always will be so long as there are so many Hebrews in the service. Would there be any practical way of working out a proposition by which a man who is required to work on one of his holy days and has no particular objection to working on our Sunday could get some compensatory time if he is required to work on his own holy day?

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I do not know of any way by which the Government can arrange to settle these religious questions as between the people who work for it. I think we had better let them alone to settle that question themselves. If they do not want to work on certain days, they need not work on those days, but that would be a question between the Government and them. I do not think we ought to provide by statute that a man who believes that Saturday is Sunday and who does not want to work on that day, or who believes that Wednesday is a holy day—something like unto the Congressmen here in respect to "Holy Wednesday"—ought to expect to have the matter adjusted for him by statute. I do not believe that that is a question with which we ought to deal.

Mr. BENNET. I am not dogmatic about it. I am simply asking for information.

Mr. MOON. I do not know of any way by which we can handle the question and inject a religious feature into the statute.

Mr. BENNET. I knew of no way, but I hoped that probably the gentleman might. I ask unanimous consent to withdraw my amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The Clerk read as follows:

For compensation to watchmen, messengers, and laborers, 1,825, at \$900 each; in all, \$1,639,500.

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order on the paragraph, consisting of lines 4 to 6, inclusive, on page 12 of this bill. And in this connection I wish to make the following statement: At the meetings of our Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads, which were held when we were framing the appropriation bill for the fiscal year of 1917, the Post Office Department submitted for our consideration an estimate of 900 watchmen, messengers, and laborers, at \$720 each, and 900 at \$840 each, aggregating an expenditure of \$1,350,000. In connection with this item and during the course of the hearings we had before our committee a gentleman representing this class of postal employees, and we accorded him a full

hearing, and after hearing that representative of these employees we changed the item which had been submitted by the department so as to make all of the 1,800 of these watchmen, messengers, and laborers receive \$840 a year each, thereby increasing the appropriation bill \$108,000. This was at the last session of Congress, and was, as I have stated, a part of the appropriation bill for the fiscal year of 1917. Now, there was no objection to it in the House and no point of order was made at the time the bill was considered, and it went through, with the approval of the House. I wish to state I favored the item and advocated it in our committee, and as I now recall the matter, it met with the unanimous support of the members of our committee. But now this year, for the appropriation bill for the fiscal year 1918, the Post Office Department did not submit any estimates for any increase in this item as to salary, but asked for \$1,530,000 to pay these men \$840, same as we provided in the bill at the last session of Congress. Not only did the Post Office Department not submit any estimate for any increase, but so far as I have information, these employees were not asking for any increase. But our committee took judicial knowledge of the high cost of living and upon our own initiative and without being asked to do so increased this item to \$900 a year for each of these employees. Since that provision was voted upon and made a part of this bill an amendment has received the favorable consideration of our committee providing a horizontal increase of all these salaries carried in the bill of from 5 to 10 per cent, the same as was put upon the Agricultural appropriation bill and the legislative, judicial, and executive appropriation bill. This 5 and 10 per cent amendment is familiar to the membership of the House, and I will not pause to discuss it at this time.

Now, let us analyze this situation as to the item I am discussing. We increased the salaries of 900 of these men last year 16½ per cent, as I have previously explained. If we go ahead and increase these salaries again this year from \$840 to \$900, this is 6½ per cent more increase. Then if we add on the 10 per cent which is provided in the amendment which is to be offered, what will be the result? We will have 900 of these men receiving an increase of 33 per cent in the last two years; we will have 900 more receiving an increase of 16½ per cent; and I feel constrained, Mr. Chairman, in view of these facts, to make this point of order. I feel it my duty to do this, because when the committee acted favorably upon the increase of \$840 to \$900 for each of these men we did not have before us the 5 and 10 per cent horizontal increase. We did not have that in mind, and it had not even been mentioned in the committee. If we go ahead and increase these employees from \$840 to \$900 each, it will amount to an increase of \$108,000, and then if we go ahead and increase the item 10 per cent more under the horizontal raise, that will be \$163,950 more, making this one item of increase \$271,950, and therefore I feel it to be my duty to make the point of order. I am in favor of making one increase, but not both of them.

The CHAIRMAN. Will the gentleman kindly state his point of order?

Mr. BLACK. My point of order, Mr. Chairman, is that this paragraph of the bill changes the existing law. The law now provides that these employees shall consist of four classes, graded in even hundreds of dollars from \$400 to \$700 a year; but these salaries have been increased in appropriation bills from year to year, without any point of order being made, and I would not make the point of order now, except that a double increase is about to be made, which even the employees themselves are not requesting. I therefore make the point of order.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, as to the number of clerks changed and the total amount of this section the point of order is probably well taken, and I do not care to discuss that, but I want to appeal to the conscience and good sense of my friend from Texas [Mr. BLACK] and to that regard and sympathy he ought to have for his fellow men in reference to questions of this sort. Here are men getting \$840 a year. Well, everybody knows, particularly in the large cities, that that is a very small amount of money for them. It is but a pittance that this committee raised the amount—just \$60 a year—giving it to all instead of a few. It does not amount to a great deal. The gentleman suggests that we will pass the 5 and 10 per cent increase. Now, the gentleman perhaps knows that that will be subject to the point of order and that a point of order will be made upon it unless we have a rule, and of course that will go out. I want to say this to the gentleman from Texas, that I believe that he ought to withdraw his point of order in the interest of these laboring people here. It is wrong to make a point of order where so little is involved to the Government and so much to the poor laboring people of this country. The gentleman ought to allow that to pass, and this little pittance of a

few dollars ought to go to them. Now, I will say this to him. If when we reach the other section containing the 5 and 10 per cent increase and that increase is made I will be willing to go back to this section and ask that it be stricken out. For the present I want him to withdraw that point and let these laboring people, who are getting less than any other class of Government employees, at least get pay enough to live upon, particularly in these great cities. [Applause.]

Mr. BLACK. Mr. Chairman, I am perfectly agreeable to any one of these increases being made, either the one from \$840 to \$900 or the increase of 10 per cent, which I have heretofore mentioned as being sure to be offered as an amendment to this bill later on; and if I can get unanimous consent that this item be passed without prejudice to my point of order, and that I may have the privilege to renew it in event the 10 per cent provision goes upon the bill before it is finally adopted, then I will gladly pass it for the present, because I want these men to have one or the other of these increases, but I do not feel justified as a member of this committee in consenting to both of such increases; and unless I can get that unanimous consent I shall have to make the point of order right at this time.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will submit any request of the gentleman.

Mr. BLACK. Then, Mr. Chairman, I ask unanimous consent that this item be passed without prejudice to my point of order, and that I may have the privilege of renewing the point of order in the event that the 5 and 10 per cent increase amendment is incorporated upon the bill before final passage.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I would ask him to put it in different shape. Let this item pass the House now, and let us have a unanimous-consent agreement to go back to it and reduce the amount back to what it is now in the event the 5 and 10 per cent proposition passes.

Mr. BLACK. All right; that suits me.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee [Mr. MOON], the chairman of the committee, asks unanimous consent that this item be considered as passed, with the understanding that if an amendment be added to the bill adding the horizontal increase of 5 and 10 per cent, the gentleman from Texas shall have the right to recur to this item and make a point of order against it. Is there objection? [After a pause.] The Chair hears none.

Mr. AYRES. Mr. Chairman, I desire to offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Kansas offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. AYRES: Page 12, line 20, after the words "one thousand," insert, as a new paragraph, the following: "That to provide, during the fiscal year 1918, for increased compensation at the rate of 10 per cent per annum to employees who receive salaries at a rate per annum less than \$1,200, and for increased compensation at the rate of 5 per cent per annum to employees who receive salaries at a rate not more than \$1,800 per annum and not less than \$1,200 per annum, so much as may be necessary is appropriated: *Provided*, That this section shall only apply to the employees who are appropriated for in the act specifically and under lump sums or whose employment is authorized herein: *Provided further*, That detailed reports shall be submitted to Congress on the first day of the next session showing the number of persons, the grades or character of positions, the original rates of compensation, and the increased rates of compensation provided for herein."

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order on that on the ground that it changes existing law.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Kansas [Mr. AYRES] desire to be heard on the point of order?

Mr. AYRES. I do not, Mr. Chairman. I presume it is subject to a point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order. It changes existing law.

Mr. MOON. Then, I understand, we do not recur to this section?

Mr. BLACK. The rule may be brought in.

The CHAIRMAN. The understanding of the Chair, and the way the Chair stated the request of the committee was, in the event an amendment was adopted to this bill providing for a 5 and 10 per cent increase, they should recur to this item and the gentleman from Texas [Mr. BLACK] should be permitted to make a point of order against it.

Mr. BLACK. That is true.

Mr. MOON. That is the way I understood it.

The Clerk read as follows:

For compensation to clerks in charge of contract stations, \$1,170,000.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word.

I regret to find that this appropriation has been increased only \$10,000. All of us coming from the large cities who are ac-

quainted with this character of work know that the work of these clerks in contract stations, usually in drug stores, has multiplied enormously with the increase of the postal business of the country. When you inquire at the department whether there is any available fund for establishing new ones they inform you that they are without funds; and yet the department estimates but \$10,000 additional for the pay of these employees in contract stations when the work in many instances has multiplied ten, twenty, thirty, and, in some instances, fifty fold. I recall that this item has not been a favored item with the Post Office Department. Their policy has been to shave down the allowances accorded to these proprietors of drug stores who perform work of a much greater value than is paid for by the small allowances they receive of from \$50 to \$1,000. There are but a few who receive the high allowance of \$1,000. Those are mostly in the larger cities of New York, Chicago, and Philadelphia. The majority are below \$300. And yet the department does not recognize the efficient work performed by these proprietors in charge of stations, but each year changes the rule of payment by requiring more service for the same allowance. It is not fair to them. They are doing work five and ten times the value of what they are paid. If the work performed by these drug-store proprietors was performed by Government clerks, it would require an appropriation of \$10,000,000 or \$15,000,000 a year. The department fails to recognize fairly the services of these drug-store proprietors.

Mr. MOON. I take it, Mr. Chairman, that the department is pretty well acquainted with the value of the services of the drug-store clerks, as well as any other employee. The truth about it is that they are generally all a little overpaid—everybody that works for the department, except a few laborers.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, if the gentleman were at all acquainted with the character of work performed at these drug-store stations, he would not make that bald statement.

Mr. MOON. I have this to say about it, Mr. Chairman: I reckon I know as much about that as the gentleman from Wisconsin. If I did not, I would know precious little about it. [Laughter.]

Mr. STAFFORD. I accede to the last proposition.

Mr. MOON. There was an unexpended balance of \$54,000 on this item last year, and the First Assistant Postmaster General, testifying before the committee, asked for an increase of only \$10,000, and said that that was all that was needed. Our committee is not in the habit of giving this department more money than it has asked for.

Mr. STAFFORD. Mr. Chairman, many times at the hearings before the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads it has been stated by the First Assistant Postmaster General that their policy was to cut down the allowances made to these proprietors of contract stations and to get them at the very lowest possible rates. It has been conceded that the work performed by these drug-store proprietors could not be performed by Government employees for less than five times what is being paid to them. And yet the gentleman from Tennessee, just because they do not have any of these stations in the little district represented by him, makes that statement, which is unfounded in fact.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. STAFFORD. I will yield to the chairman of the committee.

Mr. MOON. The gentleman from Wisconsin, I presume, is speaking from his experience in the city where he lives?

Mr. STAFFORD. No; I am relying on the testimony that has been given before the Post Office Committee in years past.

Mr. MOON. I do not know as to the years past, but in the present year only \$10,000 more is asked, and last year the department had \$54,000 left over.

Now, that is a question of administration and policy that we can not settle here by the increase of an appropriation or the decrease of it. We must look to what the department says it needs, unless somebody can show otherwise.

Mr. STAFFORD. I am not criticizing the committee. I commenced my statement by criticizing the department for not recognizing this service and for cutting down the allowances.

The CHAIRMAN. The pro forma amendment is withdrawn, and the Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For temporary and auxiliary clerk hire and for substitute clerk hire for clerks and employees absent with pay at first and second class post offices and temporary and auxiliary clerk hire at summer and winter resort post offices, \$2,300,000.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from New York offers an amendment, which the Clerk will report.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment offered by Mr. BENNET: Page 12, after line 17, insert the following:

"Provided, That hereafter the Postmaster General is authorized to grant to post-office clerks and other employees in first and second class post offices and letter carriers in the City Free Delivery Service and letter carriers in the Rural Free Delivery Service not to exceed two weeks' sick leave in any one year with pay."

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on the amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee makes a point of order on the amendment. The Chair will hear the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Chairman, the amendment just read was offered for the purpose of granting a measure of relief to postal employees who are compelled to give up their work on account of sickness. These employees live on a wage from which they can store up but little to protect them against disease and mishap. Proper convalescence is necessary to the sick individual that he may regain his damaged health and be again of the value equal to his former value to the service in which he is engaged.

When the Post Office appropriation bill was under consideration in the first session of the Sixty-fourth Congress, I offered an amendment to that bill similar to the one I have now proposed. A point of order was raised against the amendment, which was sustained by the Chair, and the House did not have an opportunity to vote on it.

Senator WADSWORTH, of New York, offered this amendment to the Post Office appropriation bill in the Senate, and it was agreed to by that body but omitted from the bill by the conference committee. Senator BANKHEAD, chairman of the Committee on Post Offices and Post Roads, wrote the Postmaster General for an opinion on the amendment and received the following reply:

* * * The employees of the executive departments in the District of Columbia and certain employees of the Federal Government outside of the District of Columbia as well as entitled under the law to leave of absence with pay on account of sickness, in addition to the leave of absence with pay authorized for the purpose of vacation. In the case of the employees of the executive departments within the District of Columbia, the law authorizes 30 days' leave of absence with pay for vacation and a maximum of 30 days with pay in addition on account of sickness. The different treatment of the two classes of employees has no basis of logic or reason, except that in conferring additional benefits and privileges to the employees of the Federal Government Congress is guided by the condition of the Postal Service. With particular reference to the employees of the Postal Service, new benefits and privileges in the way of increased compensation and improved conditions of employment have been authorized by Congress gradually during the recent years, in accordance with the same principles and tendencies which have governed the improvement of working conditions in private employment, and these additional benefits and privileges have been accorded in proportion as the condition of the postal finances and the increasing efficiency of the postal organization would permit.

It seems to me that, although the provision for leave of absence with pay on account of illness, as provided for in Senator WADSWORTH'S proposed amendment, is sound in principle, it would be inexpedient at this time for Congress to give favorable consideration to it because of the condition of the Public Treasury.

This statement of the Postmaster General should be sufficient proof that this amendment should be enacted into law.

The Canadian letter carriers are paid for all bona fide sickness up to 12 months in any one year, and if unable to resume their duties at the end of 12 months it is usual to pension them.

Sickness among postal employees is responsible for an annual wage loss that is enormous. It is a deplorable condition, and when properly understood and given full publicity will result in a public demand for a remedy. The whole burden of sickness now falls on the employees, and the only relief they get is through the fraternal organizations of the employees that maintain sick-benefit relief funds. The city letter carriers are paying benefits to the members of their association of approximately \$6,000 a month. In the city of New York the local association of letter carriers paid to its members in that city during 1916 in sick and death benefits a sum in excess of \$30,000.

Wage studies show that the slender savings of workmen are inadequate to meet the burden of sickness. A recent investigation of 700 sick wage earners by the Russell Sage Foundation disclosed that, in addition to using up savings, the deprivation of income was met (1) by relief societies; (2) by relatives and friends, who were undermining their own health and strength in order to help others; (3) by employers and trade-unions; and (4) by borrowing money, taking in lodgers, sending the wife to work, committing children to institutions, and moving to cheaper quarters—all of which tend to reduce the standard of living and to multiply sickness.

It is contended that to a great extent the conditions under which postal employees perform their work is largely responsible for the sickness which assails them. Insanitary, poorly lighted, and badly ventilated workrooms, the speeding-up system, and the working of overtime undermines the vigor and resisting power of the employees and lead to illnesses which are purely occupational.

The enactment of the Federal workmen's compensation law will stand to the credit of the Sixty-fourth Congress as one of the most constructive pieces of progressive legislation ever placed on the statutes. If the history of this class of legislation in the several States is followed out, it will result in safeguards being thrown around the Federal employees that will reduce from one-half to two-thirds of the accidents that were formerly considered inevitable.

It is my opinion that in order to protect the health of these employees it will be necessary to enact legislation that will insure their earnings against sickness. Pending the enactment of health insurance legislation I believe it is the duty of Congress to remedy existing and aggravated conditions that menace the health of the postal employees, and for this reason I am sorry that the gentleman from Tennessee insists on the point of order.

I think I might possibly persuade some chairmen, but I have my doubts about persuading the present chairman; he is so well versed in parliamentary law. I would like to contend that it is a mere limitation, but I fear it is an attempt to control the discretion of the Postmaster General. Therefore I am constrained to concede the point of order. [Laughter.]

The CHAIRMAN. The point of order is sustained.

Mr. BENNET. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks in the Record.

The CHAIRMAN. Is there objection to the gentleman's request?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For rent, light, and fuel for first, second, and third class post offices, \$5,900,000: *Provided*, That the Postmaster General may, in the disbursement of the appropriation for such purposes, apply a part thereof to the purpose of leasing premises for the use of post offices of the first, second, and third classes at a reasonable annual rental, to be paid quarterly for a term not exceeding 10 years; and that there shall not be allowed for the use of any third-class post office for rent a sum in excess of \$500, nor more than \$100 for fuel and light, in any one year: *Provided further*, That hereafter the Postmaster General may establish, under such rules and regulations as he may prescribe, one or more branch offices, stations, or nonaccounting offices of any post office for the transaction of such postal business as may be required for the convenience of the public: *Provided further*, That no first, second, or third class post office shall be made a nonaccounting office: *And provided further*, That the Postmaster General shall have authority hereafter, in his discretion, to reestablish as a post office of the second or third class any post-office station which has been heretofore or may hereafter be established by reason of the discontinuance of such post office; and the appropriations made in this act are made available for the necessary expense of conducting such reestablished post office of the second or third class. The salary of the postmaster at such office shall be based on the gross receipts of the station for the previous calendar year.

Mr. TOWNER. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on that section, on the paragraph from and after line 20, on page 13, and including all the rest of the paragraph, as being new legislation and not in accordance with existing law and in contravention of existing law. I presume that the chairman will admit that it is subject to a point of order.

Mr. MOON. I want to suggest, Mr. Chairman, that this is a section that will save the keeping of about 115,000 accounts of the Government, and save probably a million or two dollars. But it is new law. If the gentleman does not want to make that saving by refusing the consideration of it, let the section go out of the bill.

Mr. TOWNER. I know that the gentleman claims that.

Mr. MOON. The gentleman knows that.

Mr. TOWNER. No; I do not know anything of the kind.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair sustains the point of order.

Mr. RANDALL. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman reserve his point of order?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair has ruled.

Mr. MOON. I ask that the Clerk read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For pay of letter carriers at offices already established, including substitutes for letter carriers absent without pay, and for the promotion of all of the letter carriers in first-class post offices from the fifth to the sixth grade and for the promotion of all of the letter carriers in second-class offices from the fourth to the fifth grade and for the promotion of 25 per cent of the letter carriers in second-class offices from the fifth to the sixth grade, City Delivery Service, \$40,550,000.

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I move to amend in line 22, page 14, by changing the figures "\$40,550,000" to "\$44,605,000."

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will report the amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

Amendment by Mr. EMERSON: Amend, on page 14, in line 22, by striking out the figures "\$40,550,000" and inserting the figures "\$44,605,000."

Mr. COX. I reserve a point of order on that amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from Indiana on the point of order.

Mr. COX. I think it changes existing law. This item is for the pay of letter carriers, including substitutes, and for the promotion of letter carriers in first-class post offices from the fifth to the sixth grade, and in second-class offices from the fourth to the fifth grade, and so forth. The act of 1907 classified these carriers and divided them up into so many classes, from one to five. This amendment can only serve one possible purpose, and that is to increase their salaries.

Mr. EMERSON. About 10 per cent.

The CHAIRMAN. If the Chair understands the amendment, it simply increases the total amount appropriated from \$40,550,000 to \$44,605,000.

Mr. COX. That is true. This is a lump-sum appropriation.

The CHAIRMAN. Does the gentleman from Indiana take the position that if this amendment is adopted the department will be required to expend this amount?

Mr. COX. I do not know whether they will be required or not. They may. I am not willing to let them have that chance unless the Chair overrules the point of order.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair is of the opinion that the amendment does not require the department to expend that amount. If the Chair believed that they would be required to expend it, he would sustain the point of order, but he does not think the amendment will require the department to expend the amount, and therefore the Chair overrules the point of order.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to ask the gentleman who offered this amendment why he wants that \$4,000,000 more?

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Chairman, I will ask the chairman of the committee why he asks me that question?

Mr. MOON. I am asking the gentleman the question because I want to get at the sense of his proposition.

Mr. EMERSON. To be honest about it, Mr. Chairman, I offer this amendment so that the department may use this money to increase the salaries of letter carriers 10 per cent.

Mr. MOON. We have not passed any proposition of that sort yet. Suppose we wait until we do that.

Mr. EMERSON. No; I think the time to make the appropriation is now.

Mr. MOON. If we do not put into the bill any authorization of the increase, what is the gentleman going to do about it then?

Mr. EMERSON. If the House votes in the \$4,000,000, we will have the money to do it with.

Mr. MOON. I hope the gentleman will not indulge in that sort of argument, because the increasing of this amount without doing anything else will not be of any effect. If the House should adopt a rule making the 5 and 10 per cent increase in order, and then should adopt that amendment to the bill, the chairman of the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads would undertake to have this bill adjusted so as to meet that legislation. I want to say to the gentleman, though, that if that is what he wants to accomplish, this \$4,000,000 will not be enough to cover this bill. It is going to take about \$16,000,000 to cover the appropriations throughout the bill that will be needed if we pass the 5 and 10 per cent horizontal increase. So I think it would be better to wait until we see whether we pass that or not, and if we do, authorize the Clerk to adjust the figures to meet that emergency. I hope the committee will not vote for this amendment.

Mr. EMERSON. I take this position, that if any class of Government employees deserve an increase, it is the letter carriers. They work in a revenue-producing department, a practically self-sustaining department. I understood the gentleman from Tennessee to say that there is a surplus in the Post Office Department. Now, this is brought in entirely in the interests of these letter carriers, who work long hours and work overtime without extra compensation.

Mr. MOON. I know what the gentleman is after; but suppose he gets that \$4,000,000 put in here, it can not be expended unless we provide by law for its application.

Mr. EMERSON. That can be taken care of later on.

Mr. MOON. The gentleman ought not to undertake to provide in advance for an appropriation until we agree that we are going to need it.

Mr. EMERSON. There is nothing in this paragraph that states how this money shall be spent; it can be used to increase the salaries of the letter carriers, who deserve it.

Mr. MOON. No; but there is no use in adding that \$4,000,000 to the bill unless there is some further action which makes it necessary.

Mr. EMERSON. I think we should provide for it now, and thus show our friendship for the men who do the hardest work in the Government service.

The CHAIRMAN. The question is on the amendment of the gentleman from Ohio [Mr. EMERSON].

The question being taken, on a division (demanded by Mr. EMERSON) there were—ayes 1, noes 30.

Accordingly the amendment was rejected.

The Clerk read as follows:

For pay of substitutes for letter carriers absent with pay and of auxiliary and temporary letter carriers at offices where city delivery is already established, \$4,100,000.

Mr. HULBERT. Mr. Chairman, I offer the following amendment.

The Clerk read as follows:

At the bottom of page 14 insert a new paragraph, as follows:

"That paragraph 2 of section 5 of the act approved August 24, 1912, entitled 'An act making appropriations for the service of the Post Office Department for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1913, and for other purposes,' be, and the same is hereby, amended so as to read:

"That in cases of emergency, or if the needs of the service require, letter carriers in the City Delivery Service and clerks and special clerks in first and second class post offices can be required to work in excess of eight hours a day, and for such additional services and for all services performed after the lapse of 10 consecutive hours between the starting time and finishing of their schedules of duty, they shall be paid at double the rate of their salaries as fixed by law."

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. HULBERT. Will the gentleman reserve the point of order?

Mr. MOON. Very well.

Mr. HULBERT. Mr. Chairman, this amendment differs from that offered by the gentleman from Illinois [Mr. BUCHANAN] in that the amendment he submitted provided for an increase of 50 per cent of the salary paid to any carrier or clerk for such period as he might be compelled to work over the regular eight hours. The carriers and clerks are honorable, patriotic, and conscientious men, who have no disposition to shirk their duty or avoid any proper responsibility, but they want an assurance of fair treatment. It is unavoidable and proper that they should be expected to work overtime under conditions of emergency. This proposed amendment provides that a carrier or clerk who shall have worked in excess of 10 consecutive hours shall be paid double time for such excess. It is an "economical penalty," designed to compel the department to authorize the employment of substitutes to dispatch the increasing business that can reasonably be anticipated.

On December 19 last I introduced H. R. 19187, which is, in substance, the amendment that is now offered to accomplish a reduction of the minimum of unnecessary amount of overtime required of postal employees, because the complaint has become general that excessive overtime is demanded of clerks and carriers. The very purpose for which the eight-hour law was enacted is being defeated by the manner in which it is being ignored. I understand, for instance, that it is a common practice in certain post offices—provoked, I suppose, by this wave of departmental economy—to request the men to appear at the office in advance of their regular reporting time and put in from a half to two hours before "ringing in" and to continue after they have "rung out" at the end of eight hours, until the particular work in hand is finished. As no record is made of this "overtime," the men receive only their normal pay for the regular hours registered. A protest from a carrier or clerk would minimize his prospects of a favorable recommendation for a promotion or increase of pay.

It would be better and less expensive if the department would adhere to the strict letter of the law and employ substitutes for the necessary overtime. They can be secured at less cost than would be paid to the regular employees for the overtime, if properly accounted for; the great army of substitutes would obtain beneficial training and experience; and a better spirit would be created among the men regularly employed. So that, as a matter of fact, this amendment, instead of placing any additional burden upon the Government, is in reality a means of saving money and promoting efficiency.

Of course, I do not expect the point of order will be waived, and therefore no opportunity will be afforded the Members of this House to express themselves upon this amendment at this time; but it will have served the purpose of bringing this deplorable condition to the attention of Congress, and I give notice that I propose to follow it up and demand a full hearing before the committee. It was not long ago that we were called upon to legislate what was supposed to be an eight-hour day for certain railroad employees. It seems to me that Uncle Sam would do well to set a more noble example by compelling his departmental chiefs to observe the provisions and enforce the eight-hour law heretofore adopted for their guidance. During the recent holiday rush the clerks in one station in the New York post office worked 36 hours overtime in 5 consecutive days, an average of 7.2 hours overtime daily. They stuck without a murmur, like the fine fellows they are, but at the end of the rush they were physical wrecks.

During the past year, in another station, the clerks, making allowance for Sundays and holidays, have averaged 1½ hours overtime on each and every one of the 307 days of the year just ended.

Will your humanitarian instincts not prompt you to waive a legal quibble over a point of order and put this amendment to the consideration of the sober judgment of the House?

Mr. MOON. This is a matter which has not had the consideration of the committee, and I think the point of order had better be pressed.

The CHAIRMAN. The amendment, in the opinion of the Chair, changes existing law and does not fall within any of the accepted classes provided for in the Holman rule. The Chair therefore sustains the point of order.

The Clerk read as follows:

For vehicle allowance, the hiring of drivers, the rental of vehicles, and the purchase and exchange and maintenance, including stable and garage facilities, of wagons or automobiles for, and the operation of, screen-wagon and city delivery and collection services, \$5,965,000: *Provided*, That the Postmaster General may, in his disbursement of this appropriation, apply a part thereof to the leasing of quarters for the housing of Government-owned automobiles at a reasonable annual rental for a term not exceeding 10 years.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Chairman, on that I reserve the point of order.

Mr. TAGUE. Mr. Chairman, I reserve the point of order. This is new legislation.

Mr. MOON. What is new legislation?

Mr. TAGUE. Providing for the housing of Government-owned automobiles. It carries an increase of \$400,000 over the appropriation of last year.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will ask the gentleman to please state to what part of the paragraph his point of order is directed.

Mr. TAGUE. I make the point of order against the amount, which is an increase over the appropriation of last year of \$400,000.

Mr. BENNET. And the leasing of quarters for the housing of Government-owned automobiles.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, the law does not fix the amount of the appropriation. If you could not change the appropriation at all you could not have a bill.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will hear the gentleman from New York.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Chairman, I simply reserved the point of order for the purpose of asking the gentleman from Tennessee a preliminary question. I wanted to ask the gentleman from Tennessee how long we had been pursuing the policy of buying automobiles for the service, and under what statute the authority was found for the leasing of quarters for automobiles that were bought under whatever authority of law there may be?

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, does the gentleman insist that that does not follow under the statute, both chapters 2 and 8, on the subject of the transportation, postal law, which gives the Postmaster General the power to employ vehicles for the transmission of the mail and requires it to be done? The word "automobile" does not mean anything but a wagon, a vehicle in which to carry the mail, and if he can buy one vehicle or another to carry the mail, he has authority under the law, and the law requires it to be done.

Mr. BENNET. I agree thoroughly with that statement of the gentleman. The gentleman is a highly capable lawyer, but the only question I asked him I think entirely through inadvertence he did not answer.

Mr. MOON. Perhaps I overlooked it.

Mr. BENNET. And that is, What portion of the postal statutes gives the Postmaster General the antecedent power to purchase automobiles or vehicles?

Mr. MOON. The statute that authorizes the carrying of the mails and the employment of vehicles would carry with it necessarily the means to obtain them. The appropriation that authorized the transportation of the mail in a general way, the gentleman will realize, would carry that, and if you could not secure it in this way it could not be done at all.

Mr. BENNET. My friend will pardon me, but it seems to me that if his logic is good that the mere requirement in the statute that the Postmaster General shall carry the mail, if it gives him the power to buy automobiles, also gives him the power that the gentleman from Maryland [Mr. LEWIS] would like to see him have without further legislation, namely, the power, if he is not satisfied with railroad rates, to buy the railroad.

Mr. MOON. I understand all this proposition now, for following right after this paragraph is the one respecting pneumatic-tube service. We will take care of that when we get to it.

Mr. LEWIS. Mr. Chairman, I rise to a question of personal privilege. I want to say to the gentleman from New York that he will have to guess again about railroads, and matters of that kind. I do not thank him for his gratuitous remarks.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chairman of the Committee of the Whole can not entertain a question of personal privilege. The gentleman from New York has the floor.

Mr. HULBERT. Mr. Chairman, will the gentleman yield?

Mr. BENNET. Yes.

Mr. HULBERT. I would like to suggest to my colleague that if he is not informed upon the subject, it might be profitable to inquire whether the Postmaster General has the power under this provision to purchase pneumatic tubes, if they are vehicles?

Mr. BENNET. Oh, of course.

Mr. MOON. I should think he would have if it were absolutely necessary to carry the mail in that way, and the purpose of the law could not otherwise be accomplished.

Mr. BENNET. I should think that would be rather an extreme construction.

Mr. TAGUE. I would like to ask the gentleman if the Postmaster General, at the hearings in answer to a question, did not answer that it was the intention to use this appropriation in lieu of the pneumatic tubes?

Mr. MOON. I do not know; but I think if the Postmaster General is as wise an executive as I believe him to be, in view of the proof in this record, he would do that very thing.

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Chairman, allow me to make this suggestion. It is a quarter of 6, and possibly if we rise at this time I might not make the point of order in the morning.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair can not control that proposition. The Chair understands the point of order to be lodged against the paragraph on the ground—

Mr. BENNET. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of order.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania rose.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, I have offered an amendment.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Illinois has sent up an amendment, which the Clerk will report. After that the Chair will recognize the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. MOORE].

The Clerk read as follows:

On page 15, line 12, insert the following: "*Provided further*, That chauffeurs and mechanics employed by the Post Office Department in the operation of screen wagon and city delivery and collection services shall be granted pay for services in excess of eight hours and compensatory time for Sunday and holiday service in the same manner as provided by law for clerks and carriers in first and second class post offices."

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I make a point of order on the amendment.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. I would like to ask the grounds upon which the gentleman makes the point of order?

Mr. MOON. That it is new law entirely.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Does not the eight-hour law apply to Government employees?

Mr. MOON. But this has no analogy whatever to the eight-hour law.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Mr. Chairman, this is for the purpose of applying the 8-hour day, and it reduces the expenditures, because when men work 10, 12, and 14 hours a day it interferes with their efficiency. I do not see where it changes the existing law, because we certainly have sufficient law for the 8-hour day. This does not change the law in regard to the overtime pay; therefore it seems to me the point of order should not be sustained.

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will ask the gentleman from Illinois a question. Under the law now do these chauffeurs and other employees named in the amendment, when they perform extra services, receive pay for it?

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. No; they do not receive extra pay.

The CHAIRMAN. Does not this amendment provide pay? Therefore does it not change the existing law?

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Not if we have an eight-hour-day law.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I suggest to the gentleman from Illinois that his amendment does not have anything analogous to the eight-hour-day law. The gentleman had better undertake to get in a rule on that question than try to get it in here, because it is out of order.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. Why raise the point of order against the applying of the eight-hour day to these men?

Mr. MOON. Because this bill has been very carefully considered and hearings had by the committee and agreed upon by the majority, and it is not a wise thing in legislation to take anybody's amendment, unless it is apparently thoroughly correct and

in accord with the law and policy of the Government, without a hearing about it. We can not allow this bill to be broken into by a matter that is neither germane nor acceptable under the rules of the House as an amendment. That is the reason.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. I understood the chairman to be in favor of the eight-hour day.

Mr. MOON. I am.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. And to be in favor of the employees of the Post Office Department; and therefore why oppose this amendment by making a point of order against it?

Mr. MOON. I am very much in favor of the eight-hour-day law and very much in favor of an increase to the laboring class of the department, but I am not in favor of increasing the salaries of those who have higher positions, because they have, perhaps, enough. We can not, because we happen to be in favor of certain things, agree to everything that comes along.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. But this is not everything that comes along.

Mr. MOON. Perhaps I should not have said that; but such things as this.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. It seemed to me it is so fair I did not expect anybody to object, even by making a point of order, and especially the chairman of the committee. I will urge the gentleman to withdraw the point of order. The purpose of the amendment is to secure an eight-hour day for the men who are doing work for the Government, which work is increasing enormously from day to day, and they are certainly entitled to the eight-hour day as much as any other employees of the Government.

Mr. MOON. I want to say, Mr. Chairman, in that connection, that that may be true, and probably is true; but we can not let this bill be invaded from every side, and we can not allow new legislation to be put into it not considered by the committee.

The rule under which we are operating prohibits this legislation, and it takes a special rule to put it in order. If there were a special rule granted so that we could proceed in an orderly way to the consideration of this matter, I think I would vote for the gentleman's proposition, but not now.

Mr. BUCHANAN of Illinois. I would like to call the Chair's attention to the fact that this is a limitation upon the expenditure of the money appropriated, by directing the manner of how it shall be spent within the law. Therefore, it seems to me it is in order.

With the rapid motorization of the Postal Service in its delivery and collection and screen-wagon service there is a constant increase in the number of chauffeurs and mechanics employed. These men, although performing a function similar to that of the carriers and collectors in the City Delivery Service, have not the protection of the eight-hour law; neither do they get compensatory time for Sunday and holiday service. The purpose of my amendment is to place them on a par with other postal workers in respect to their hours of employment and their days off. It is simply an effort to wipe out the existing discrimination.

At present the chauffeurs and mechanics employed in this service are forced to work excessively long hours at times. Their hours are fixed by a departmental regulation on the basis of 8 hours within 12 hours. My amendment would fix the hours as 8 within 10 hours. In the absence of any penalty—they receive no pay for overtime—they are frequently compelled to work many hours in excess of 8.

The collectors in the City Delivery Service justly have the benefit of an 8-hour day within 10 hours, a guaranteed weekly rest day, and compensatory time for holiday service. These chauffeurs perform almost an identical function. It is rank discrimination to deprive them of the protection of the laws governing the other employees doing a like service.

Both the chauffeurs and the mechanics perform arduous service. They are Government civil-service employees, and should have the same consideration as is shown their fellow employees.

Mr. MOON. I will say in reply to that, if the limitation is in order—

The CHAIRMAN. Even were the amendment a limitation, and the limitation interfered with executive discretion, it would be subject to a point of order. And the Chair is of the opinion that the amendment contravenes existing law, and therefore sustains the point of order.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I move to strike out the last word, and I would like to ask the Chair if I understood him to rule a little while ago that a point of order would not lie against the amount of the appropriation, \$5,965,000, which is an increase over the amount of the appropriation made last year?

The CHAIRMAN. The Chair will not state how he will rule until the point of order is made and it is up to him to pass upon the matter. The Chair ruled on one point of order some time ago that an amendment changing the amount of appropriation did not require the department to expend the appropriation.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I call the attention of the Chair to the fact that the appropriation provided for in this bill is \$5,965,000, and that it is for vehicle allowance, the hiring of drivers, the rental of vehicles, and the purchase and exchange and maintenance, including stable and garage facilities, of wagons or automobiles for, and the operation of, screen-wagon and city-delivery and collection services.

Mr. MADDEN. Will the gentleman yield to me there?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Yes.

Mr. MADDEN. All the screen-wagon service performed by the Government now is performed by Government-owned machines in most of the cities. You can not meet trains with anything but either automobiles or wagons, and it is necessary to increase the amount of this appropriation to meet the growing needs of the service.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. In the cities?

Mr. MADDEN. In the cities—and it does not make any difference as to what is done with pneumatic tubes—this service must be continued and increased from time to time to meet the increasing demands of the service.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. The chairman of the committee has indicated that we are approaching the pneumatic-tube item, which is a fact, and I wanted to call attention now to the situation that confronts us.

The Postmaster General asks here for \$400,000 more this year than he had last year for the purchase of screen wagons, automobiles, and so forth, to be used in the city postal service. And by a rather interesting coincidence it develops that that is very nearly the amount of the cut of the appropriation recommended by the Postmaster General in the matter of the pneumatic-tube service. Therefore, instead of saving an enormous amount of money by attempting the destruction of the pneumatic-tube service, the Postmaster General is simply transferring the amount that he pretends to save on the pneumatic-tube service to the purchase of screen wagons for city use. There is very little saving in the philosophy of the Postmaster General. I want the gentlemen to know that, because it is an interesting fact now that we are approaching, as the chairman of the committee has reminded us, the item of the pneumatic-tube service.

Mr. MOON. That is what makes you so nervous—the fact that we are approaching that item. This has nothing to do with the pneumatic-tube service.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. It is to be used in the city service where the tubes are to be displaced; but we are not nervous.

Mr. MOON. If we are to buy automobiles we will give a few automobiles to your city.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. We are trying to get them off the streets, because instead of a rural service in the city we would like to have a modern and sensible service underground. I repeat, it is interesting to observe that while the committee and the Postmaster General pretend they are saving a lot of money to the Government by abolishing the pneumatic service they are transferring what it costs to the automobile service.

Mr. MOON. That is not correct.

Mr. GALLIVAN. Will the gentleman yield?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I yield.

Mr. GALLIVAN. I wanted to say to the gentleman from Pennsylvania [Mr. Moore] perhaps this has something to do with the proposed abolition of the pneumatic tubes, even though my friend from Tennessee does not think so. I want to suggest to the gentleman from Pennsylvania that I have just received a telegram from Boston. It comes from one of the most distinguished citizens of my city, and it says this:

As evidence of the insolent disregard of the action of Congress upon question of retaining or abandoning pneumatic-tube service, post-office employees, Inspector Charles P. Stearns and I. O. Keen, of Koons's office, here arranging for autos to perform work now done by tubes. This insolence should be called to attention of Congress; generally believed, since Government established, that departments were creatures of Congress, not its masters. This action illustrates attitude of present post-office régime, that Congress should follow its wishes rather than it must obey the mandates of Congress.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I ask for one minute.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania asks that his time be extended for one minute. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman has taken his seat, and the Clerk will read.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I understood that I had a minute.

The CHAIRMAN. Yes; the Chair submitted the gentleman's request, and the committee granted it, but the gentleman from Pennsylvania took his seat; whereupon the Chair directed the Clerk to read.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. If the Chair will permit me to take advantage of half a minute, and so long as the word "insolent" has been used—

Mr. MADDEN. The telegram refers to the "insolence of the department" in disregarding the action of Congress.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. I thank the gentleman for stating the fact. Congress might sometimes be misled, unless duly and independently informed upon this subject of the pneumatic-tube service.

Mr. MOON. Oh, yes; that is the opinion of almost everybody from Philadelphia and Boston and a few other places.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. We still have some rights and are doing the best we can to maintain them.

The CHAIRMAN. The Clerk will read.

The Clerk read as follows:

For mail-messenger service, \$2,243,000.

Mr. McARTHUR. Mr. Chairman, I suggest the absence of the dollar mark before the figures "2,243,000," on line 13 of page 15.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, the dollar mark is already in this bill.

Mr. McARTHUR. I will state to the gentleman from Tennessee that it is not in my copy.

The CHAIRMAN. If the chairman of the committee will turn to line 13 of page 15, "For mail-messenger service," he will find that the dollar mark is omitted.

Mr. MOON. It is not omitted in this copy. Let it be there, for that is what they want. [Laughter.]

Mr. STEENERSON. Mr. Chairman, I would like to say to the chairman of the committee that I believe we are now approaching that contentious clause, the pneumatic-tube service, and before the gentleman from Tennessee moves that the committee rise I would like to address the committee for five minutes in regard to the correction of the Record as to some remarks delivered yesterday.

Mr. MOON. Why do you not just expunge that speech and let the rest remain. [Laughter.]

Mr. COX. Mr. Chairman—

Mr. STEENERSON. The gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox] might object to that. The gentleman from Indiana has changed the remarks he made to which I replied yesterday, thereby making my reply appear without real reason. I hold in my hand the Official Reporter's minutes of what the gentleman from Indiana did say, and what I had a colloquy with him about, and the Official Reporter's original minutes show that he referred to the remarks that I had made in my speech in which I said that the report of the Auditor for the Post Office Department showed that there was a deficit for the last three fiscal years.

Mr. MOON. I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman, that there is nothing before the House.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee makes the point of order that there is nothing before the House.

Mr. STEENERSON. I would like to have unanimous consent, Mr. Chairman, to proceed for five minutes.

Mr. MOON. Wait a minute. I make the point of order, Mr. Chairman, that that is a matter that can not come up in the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, but can only be taken up in the House.

Mr. STEENERSON. I am not seeking to correct the Record, but I simply want to call the attention of the gentleman from Indiana [Mr. Cox] to the fact that the remarks that I replied to are not the remarks that he has put into the Record. I am correct in what I said and he puts into the Record something that makes my statement incorrect.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Minnesota [Mr. STEENERSON] asks unanimous consent to address the committee for five minutes. Is that the gentleman's request?

Mr. STEENERSON. Yes.

Mr. COX. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I simply want to say that I secured, by unanimous consent, leave to revise and extend my remarks in the Record.

Mr. STEENERSON. Even if the gentleman did, he would not have the right to make those changes.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, I think the purpose of the gentleman from Minnesota has been satisfied by the statement he has made, and I would request him not to press his request now, but that

he will let it come up in the morning after we inserted the pneumatic-tube service item.

Mr. STEENERSON. No; I will do it before then. I will do it as a matter of personal privilege in the House to-morrow, if that is insisted upon. But I have just been handed the minutes of the Official Reporter, in which the gentleman from Indiana is shown to have changed the statements in which he criticized me. I said the Record proved one thing, and the remarks of the gentleman says something else.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman is not in order. The gentleman from Minnesota asks unanimous consent to address the committee for five minutes. Is there objection?

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Reserving the right to object, Mr. Chairman, that would require a reply of five minutes, would it not?

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I object. I move the committee do now rise.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee moves that the committee do now rise. The question is on agreeing to that motion.

The question was taken.

The CHAIRMAN. The motion is agreed to. [Cries of "Division!"] Several gentlemen have demanded a division. Those in favor of the motion that the committee do now rise will rise and remain standing until they are counted. [After counting.] Twenty-seven gentlemen have arisen in the affirmative. The ayes will be seated, and the noes will rise and remain standing until they are counted. [After counting.] Forty-two gentlemen have arisen in the negative. On this question the ayes are 27 and the noes are 42. The committee refuses to rise.

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count.

Pending the count,

Mr. MOORE of Pennsylvania. Mr. Chairman, I withdraw the point of no quorum.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Pennsylvania withdraws the point. The Clerk will read.

Mr. MOON. Mr. Chairman, I make the point of order that there is no quorum present.

The CHAIRMAN. The gentleman from Tennessee makes the point of order that there is no quorum present. The Chair will count.

Mr. MANN. Mr. Chairman, I move that the committee do now rise.

The motion was agreed to.

Accordingly the committee rose; and the Speaker having resumed the chair, Mr. CRISP, Chairman of the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union, reported that that committee had had under consideration the Post Office appropriation bill (H. R. 19410) and had come to no resolution thereon.

ENROLLED BILLS SIGNED.

Mr. LAZARO, from the Committee on Enrolled Bills, reported that they had examined and found truly enrolled bills of the following titles, when the Speaker signed the same:

H. R. 10007. An act for the relief of William H. Woods; and H. R. 10093. An act for the relief of James Anderson.

The SPEAKER announced his signature to enrolled bill of the following title:

S. 6864. An act providing for the continuance of the Osage Indian School, Oklahoma, for a period of 1 year from January 1, 1917.

HOUSE OF MEETING TO-MORROW.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock to-morrow.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from North Carolina asks unanimous consent that when the House adjourns to-day it adjourn to meet at 11 o'clock a. m. to-morrow. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

LEAVE TO PRINT.

Mr. TAVENNER. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks on the subject of Government manufacture of munitions.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Illinois [Mr. TAVENNER] asks unanimous consent to extend his remarks on the subject of Government manufacture of munitions. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

Mr. FESS. I ask unanimous consent to extend my remarks by printing in the Record a résumé of documents pertaining to peace.

The SPEAKER. The gentleman from Ohio asks unanimous consent to print in the RECORD a résumé of documents in the interest of peace. Is there objection?

There was no objection.

ADJOURNMENT.

Mr. KITCHIN. Mr. Speaker, I move that the House do now adjourn.

The motion was agreed to; accordingly (at 6 o'clock and 8 minutes p. m.) the House, under its previous order, adjourned until to-morrow, Saturday, January 13, 1917, at 11 o'clock a. m.

EXECUTIVE COMMUNICATIONS, ETC.

Under clause 2 of Rule XXIV, a letter from the Secretary of the Treasury, transmitting estimate of appropriation in the sum of \$250,000 for intercoastal communications (H. Doc. No. 1927), was taken from the Speaker's table, referred to the Committee on Appropriations, and ordered to be printed.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the several calendars therein named, as follows:

Mr. MAYS, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (S. 4282) to permit the State of Wyoming to relinquish to the United States lands heretofore selected and to select other lands from the public domain in lieu thereof, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1282), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. KENT, from the Committee on the Public Lands, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 18565) to authorize sale of certain land in Alabama to the heirs at law of Thomas Tumlin, deceased, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1283), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

Mr. TILLMAN, from the Committee on Indian Affairs, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 6444) providing for the payment of certain items of interest on the judgment of the Court of Claims of May 18, 1905, in favor of the Cherokees, and for other purposes, reported the same with amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1284), which said bill and report were referred to the Committee of the Whole House on the state of the Union.

REPORTS OF COMMITTEES ON PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 2 of Rule XIII, private bills and resolutions were severally reported from committees, delivered to the Clerk, and referred to the Committee of the Whole House, as follows:

Mr. ALEXANDER, from the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 19904) to grant authority to the Reiss Steamship Co., of Duluth, Minn., to change the name of its steamer *Frank T. Heffelfinger* to *Clemens A. Reiss*, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1285), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 19901) to grant authority to the Reiss Steamship Co., of Duluth, Minn., to change the name of its steamer *Frederick B. Wells* to *Otto M. Reiss*, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1286), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 19902) to grant authority to the Reiss Steamship Co., of Duluth, Minn., to change the name of its steamer *Frank H. Peavey* to *William L. Reiss*, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1287), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

He also, from the same committee, to which was referred the bill (H. R. 19903) to grant authority to the Reiss Steamship Co., of Duluth, Minn., to change the name of its steamer *George W. Peavey* to *Richard J. Reiss*, reported the same without amendment, accompanied by a report (No. 1288), which said bill and report were referred to the Private Calendar.

PUBLIC BILLS, RESOLUTIONS, AND MEMORIALS.

Under clause 3 of Rule XXII, bills, resolutions, and memorials were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. HILLIARD: A bill (H. R. 20038) to provide Federal aid in caring for indigent tuberculous persons, to provide for a

division of tuberculosis in the United States Public Health Service, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. WOODS of Iowa: A bill (H. R. 20039) providing for the licensing of weighers of farm products at commercial centers and the licensing of inspectors of scales and other weighing devices, and making appropriation therefor; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SEARS: A bill (H. R. 20040) to amend the irrigation act of March 3, 1891 (26 Stats., 1095), section 18, and to amend section 2 of the act of May 11, 1898 (30 Stats., 404); to the Committee on Irrigation of Arid Lands.

By Mr. HASTINGS: A bill (H. R. 20041) providing for the appointment of three commissioners to the Five Civilized Tribes in Oklahoma to examine and report the names of those adult restricted Indians from whom restrictions should be removed; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. SCOTT of Pennsylvania: A bill (H. R. 20042) giving Federal courts power to suspend sentences and penalties; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MUDD: A bill (H. R. 20043) to confer jurisdiction on the Court of Claims to inquire into whether or not the immigrant Cherokees by blood are entitled to be reimbursed for lands allotted to negro freedmen Cherokees from lands granted to immigrant Cherokees by blood under treaty of 1835, and inquire into and determine the validity of the treaty of 1866; to the Committee on Indian Affairs.

By Mr. BYRNES of South Carolina: A bill (H. R. 20044) to regulate commerce in adulterated and misbranded seed, and to prevent the sale and transportation thereof, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. GLASS: A bill (H. R. 20045) to amend the act approved December 23, 1913, known as the Federal reserve act; to the Committee on Banking and Currency.

By Mr. NEELY: A bill (H. R. 20046) providing for the appointment and recommission as officers on the active list of the United States Army persons who were formerly officers; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. CLINE: A bill (H. R. 20047) for the control and regulation of the waters of Niagara River above the Falls, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

By Mr. CARY: A bill (H. R. 20048) providing for an advisory referendum by the people of the District of Columbia on certain questions relating to municipal self-government and representation in Congress; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. LOBECK: Resolution (H. Res. 440) providing for the consideration of House bill 16060; to the Committee on Rules.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ANTHONY: A bill (H. R. 20049) for the relief of Maude Craig Smyser; to the Committee on Claims.

By Mr. COADY: A bill (H. R. 20050) granting an increase of pension to Mary List; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. DEWALT: A bill (H. R. 20051) granting a pension to William H. Trautman; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. DICKINSON: A bill (H. R. 20052) for the relief of the estate of Henry Cooper, deceased; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. DOREMUS: A bill (H. R. 20053) granting an increase of pension to Alfred P. Haskill; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. EDWARDS: A bill (H. R. 20054) to allow a pension of \$30 per month to Edward Marvin Carter, of Savannah, Ga., loss of eye at military camp, Macon, Ga., on July 30, 1916, while serving in the United States Army; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FARR: A bill (H. R. 20055) granting a pension to Martin E. Godwin; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. FOCHT: A bill (H. R. 20056) granting an increase of pension to Samuel P. Burns; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20057) granting an increase of pension to Christian Bechtel; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. GODWIN of North Carolina: A bill (H. R. 20058) granting a pension to M. B. Cavanaugh; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. HEATON: A bill (H. R. 20059) granting an increase of pension to Susanna Rose; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HENSLEY: A bill (H. R. 20060) granting an increase of pension to George C. Whitener; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. HOWARD: A bill (H. R. 20061) granting an increase of pension to Frank R. Barfoot; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. JOHNSON of Washington: A bill (H. R. 20062) granting a pension to Jane Mathilda McDonald; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20063) granting an increase of pension to Thomas A. Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KEY of Ohio: A bill (H. R. 20064) granting an increase of pension to Samuel M. Reese; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KINCHELOE: A bill (H. R. 20065) granting an increase of pension to Francis M. Barker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LIEB: A bill (H. R. 20066) granting an increase of pension to Joseph Moore; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. LITTLEPAGE: A bill (H. R. 20067) granting an increase of pension to Samuel H. Samples; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20068) granting an increase of pension to Clara Wildman; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20069) granting an increase of pension to Albert Booker; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

Also, a bill (H. R. 20070) granting a pension to Chesley Rhoden; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. LOBECK: A bill (H. R. 20071) granting an increase of pension to James Doyle; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. MAGEE: A bill (H. R. 20072) granting a pension to Agnes A. Brady; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. RUSSELL of Missouri: A bill (H. R. 20073) for the relief of Austin Shinn; to the Committee on War Claims.

By Mr. SCOTT of Michigan: A bill (H. R. 20074) granting a pension to William Chalender; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STEENERSON: A bill (H. R. 20075) granting an increase of pension to John F. Gibbons; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SULLOWAY: A bill (H. R. 20076) granting an increase of pension to Charles H. Giles; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. SUTHERLAND: A bill (H. R. 20077) granting an increase of pension to America Postelwait; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. WM. ELZA WILLIAMS: A bill (H. R. 20078) granting an increase of pension to Isham Raney; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. KEY of Ohio: Resolution (H. Res. 441) authorizing the payment of \$1,200 to William McKinley Cobb for extra and expert services rendered to the Committee on Pensions during the second session of the Sixty-fourth Congress; to the Committee on Accounts.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of Rule XXII, petitions and papers were laid on the Clerk's desk and referred as follows:

By Mr. BROWNE: Petition of members of Ed. Sere Post, Grand Army of the Republic, of Wautoma, Wis., protesting against the removal of the soldiers' home from Milwaukee, Wis.; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of several residents of Manitowoc, Wis., protesting against House bill 18986, Senate bills 4429 and 1082, House joint resolution 84, and House bill 17850; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BRUCKNER: Petitions and memorials of Central Federated Union, of New York; Everyday Mechanics' Magazine, of New York; Lucas & Dahe Co., of Rochester, N. Y.; clerk's office, Common Council of Philadelphia; Ellburt Printing Co., of New York; Harkner J. Brower, of New York; and E. Lee Montague's Sons, of New York, in reference to legislation carried in the Post Office bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of Navy Yard Retirement Association, in favor of pensions for civil-service employees; to the Committee on Reform in the Civil Service.

Also, petition of Timothy C. Murphy, of Connecticut, in re bill for rewarding holders of life-saving medals; to the Committee on the Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. COADY: Petition of numerous citizens of Maryland, against prohibition; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. DALE of New York: Petitions of Central Federated Union, of New York; clerk's office, Common Council of Philadelphia; and the Crockery Board of Trade, of New York, in re postal legislation; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. EAGAN: Petitions of sundry citizens of New Jersey, opposing prohibition bills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of W. T. H., in favor of Hayden game bill; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

Also, memorial of clerk's office, Common Council of Philadelphia, in re pneumatic-tube service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Mrs. A. W. Durell, of Woodbury, N. J., in favor of Susan B. Anthony amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Men-Suffrage Association Opposed to Political Suffrage for Women, of New York, in re woman suffrage; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. ESCH: Petitions of Ernest Schliet and 26 other residents of La Crosse, Wis., against prohibition bills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. FITZGERALD: Memorial of Crockery Board of Trade of New York, opposing the discontinuance of the pneumatic-tube service in New York City or Brooklyn, N. Y.; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, memorial of select and common councils of the city of Philadelphia, Pa., protesting against the abolition of the tube service in the city of Philadelphia; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. FOCHT: Papers to accompany House bill 19900 for relief of Daniel Gorsert; to the Committee on Invalid Pensions.

By Mr. FULLER: Petition of American Federation of Labor, favoring citizenship for the inhabitants of Porto Rico; to the Committee on Insular Affairs.

Also, memorial of 35 members of Davisville Grange, of Illinois, for a commission to investigate an alleged monopoly in raw sisal; to the Committee on Agriculture.

Also, petition of Rockford (Ill.) Aerie Fraternal Order of Eagles, protesting against increase of postage rates on fraternal magazines; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of Nonsuffrage Association, of New York, opposing a constitutional amendment granting suffrage to women; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Chamber of Commerce of the State of New York, favoring the pneumatic-tube service; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petition of American Institute of Architects, for the creation of a commission of experts on public buildings; to the Committee on Public Buildings and Grounds.

Also, petition of Prany Co., of Chicago, favoring the vocational educational bill; to the Committee on Education.

Also, petition of United Spanish War Veterans, of Boston, Mass., for increase of pay, etc., for clerks of the Quartermaster Corps; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. GALLIVAN: Memorials of select and common councils of Philadelphia and the Central Federated Union of New York in reference to legislation in Post Office bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. GILLET: Three petitions, containing 145 names, residents of Springfield, Mass., for national prohibition amendment; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. GRIEST: Petition of 41 citizens of Lancaster County, Pa., for a Christian amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petitions of citizens of Lancaster, Pa., protesting against legislation proposed by House bills 17850 and 18986, Senate bills 1082 and 4429, and House joint resolution 84; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Lancaster Branch, German-American Alliance of Pennsylvania, asking for an embargo on all grains and food products; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. GRIFFIN: One hundred and forty-two petitions of sundry citizens, firms, and organizations indorsing 1-cent drop-letter postage, as recommended in Postmaster General's report; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, 29 petitions and memorials of sundry citizens, firms, and organizations, opposing any increase in second-class postage rates; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. HILLIARD: Petition of Denver Civic and Commercial Association, for removal of limitation on expenditures for the Rocky Mountain National Park; to the Committee on the Public Lands.

By Mr. IGOE: Petition of Joseph Houser, St. Louis, Mo., secretary local union of the United Brewery Workers of America, favoring an additional appropriation for the naturalization bureau for their field service; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. KIESS of Pennsylvania: Petition of citizens of the fifteenth Pennsylvania district, praying for the passage of House resolution 264; to the Committee on Rules.

By Mr. LIEB: Petition of John H. Derrill, John Sullivan, Henry Faust, C. W. Tweedall, C. H. Wessell, Jake Yestingsmeier, Tony Fortune, Charles White, Ed. Sweeney, Frank Dimick, W. S. Schnell, Henry Wargel, Jacob Hirsch, John Emrich, Henry F. Holtz, August Holtz, John Reuter, Joe Wargel, Fred Seeber, Ben Engbers, Oscar Meyer, Henry Enchers, George Seeber, Ben Zeller, George L. Paul, Joseph L. Martin, Frank Ottman, Joseph Schwart, L. B. Happe, John Howe, Wendel Leangel, Norbert Happe, Christ C. Uhde, George Klinger, John Altergett, John Will, John Duncan, Ben Barwe, S. Sertz, George Silk, George Bitzel, John Bachmer, Aug. Frick, John Barthel, Henry Haaga, James Gish, Earl Harl, Phillip Hisch, Benjamin J. Frielinghauser, Vall Zellers, John Hack, J. B. Lingemann, Clarence Hardy, Walter Ladd, Peter Strack, A. Fairchild, Frank Rohr, Peter Rieber, Charles Muschler, John Dietz, Frank Deutsch, William Hartig, M. Barnes, J. Barnes, H. Fox, Frank C. Wepf, Garlan Hunter, Ben Mahlerty, Alex. Masen, Roy Kinel, Earl Rover, Will Gaines, Ruben Payne, Berila Smith, Frank Turpin, Tom Fields, James Trevtham, Emmitt Laye, Ernest Dodson, John Letcher, Louis Johnson, R. Powell, Jewel Forms, Wilham Brooks, Ernest Haden, Frank Ehrman, John Dodds, James Gans, Milton Parrish, Carl Gardner, George Dawson, George Gant, Willie Moore, Charles Stallman, Auston Perkins, William Judson, C. P. Sharp, J. P. Shaffer, John Vaughn, Walter Watson, Grant Cole, Thomas Parrish, H. W. Lodson, R. H. Johnson, Robert Fenwick, West Gains, Tom Davis, Will Gains, O. Nance, Sol Breap, George Russell, Henry Irvin, George Hays, Jeston McFarland, Willie Payne, Richard Cox, Morris Rankin, and George Crider, of Evansville, Ind., protesting against the passage of Randall mail-exclusion bill, Bankhead mail-exclusion bill, Sheppard District prohibition bill, Webb nation-wide prohibition bill, and Howard bill to prohibit commerce in intoxicating liquors between the States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of McElroy Taylor, W. H. Bostic, William Brannon, Amos Reed, George Crawford, August Cobell, D. L. Stratton, Mark Saunders, George Platz, Anton Cellerbusch, J. W. Cowell, William Shaffer, George Doran, Homer Rowans, Mark H. Joseph, F. J. Suffert, John Stetzel, Joseph Boston, Jr., G. W. Harmon, William J. Enlow, Oscar Siecks, Oscar Koeppel, Joseph Rohlf, Jr., T. E. Davidson, George E. Wright, John H. Cox, Horace Allen, Leroy Johnson, John Rogies, W. A. Jordan, Ollie Fabian, W. T. Hinman, Henry Pillman, J. W. Holmer, C. Jackson, A. E. Nenelss, H. W. Minch, L. E. Leseure, Walter C. Becker, E. B. Dean, Jacob Scherer, J. A. Cook, Ed. Bruner, Morris Pfohl, Naman G. Bee, William Hayney, J. Binup, J. F. Tooley, W. T. Tooley, George Gillis, J. G. Hedderick, Edw. C. Kemmeling, J. R. Langford, B. F. Megara, R. M. Beyer, E. D. Klaser, F. Frick, Donald M. Kinney, John H. Taylor, Mike Schaeffer, John F. Gross, Rudolph Becker, Edward H. Rose, H. E. Fitch, George A. Heitzman, N. J. Hewtor, William Hanley, George J. Neines, A. Adams, H. Moore, John John, C. L. Cartwright, Edward J. Heitzman, C. Rager, John Stanley, W. B. Griffith, Leroy Johnson, Joe Cohoon, Ray Shields, Thomas Shields, J. McEwen, W. K. Keoner, Jacob Gerard, Joe Serdental, A. S. Voss, Earl Castlen, Jacob Thiel, John Sudenthal, Henry Guise, George Kammero, David Duncan, E. S. Sheely, William Pike, Eli Auspach, R. E. Uhrig, J. F. Willmeyer, S. R. Johnson, F. W. Gilmore, Peter B. Moll, Peter Wallace, George William Klein, Fred Street, William Weidner, Andrew Loesch, F. Hosse, F. L. Mueller, Nicholas Kohl, sr., Will J. Lappe, jr., James P. Hon, Walker Baker, Horace Wilson, Homer Tamer, William Lyons, Paul Berger, Herman Jones, G. P. Sharp, Charles W. Rustin, F. H. Meyer, Ed. Bitter, Peter Aeker, Cecil Kifer, Ben Howard, Sam Crumbaker, P. D. Drain, Louis P. Bohn, jr., Louis Lienert, Frank Maas, Aug. F. Illing, V. Lehon, Robert Witzmann, Joe Maers, George Schaefer, jr., Frank Schaefer, Harry Stubbs, John A. Becker, Aug. C. Weevner, and Andy Richardt, all of Evansville, Ind., protesting against passage of Randall mail-exclusion bill, Bankhead mail-exclusion bill, Sheppard District prohibition bill, Webb nation-wide prohibition bill, and Howard bill to prohibit commerce in intoxicating liquors between the States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Albert Schmadel, Otto A. Kenkel, Fred Walleon, John E. Brenle, T. R. Parrett, A. E. Gore, Harry Kroeker, C. K. McDonald, Ed. Burke, Henry Espenseseld, Walter Brizius, Oscar Ketenger, Dewey Clemans, Willard E. Curry, Charles K. Aesop, Louis J. Klinger, John Klaser, Joseph P. Zimmerman, F. J. Munnenense, M. Flund, L. Wintner, Ed. Elmendorf, George Geur, August Fuehring, Arthur Booth, John Lampkins, Elmer L. Fay, Charles Rosttger, C. G. Meekes, Thomas Palmer, Albert C. Gronothe, George W. Dodd, Charles J. Brase, Robert H. Working, William Crisel, George F. Keck, A. W. Hagensieker, Frank Mayer, A. T. Whitman, H. C. Koenig, Ray Youngblood, Charles Gardner, Frank Benton, Otto Roeder,

Charles Durbin, W. J. Love, Clem H. Goedde, A. H. Harneshfege, George Wix, A. G. F. Deckin, F. Klismeler, Wayne Adams, Thomas Grubb, Ben Flester, Gus S. Narter, H. H. Angel, Will Rough, William C. Ohlrogg, W. B. Crawford, Val Kullmann, Harry Balzer, Charles Griesse, jr., T. A. Henders, William J. Meyer, E. Wood, G. William Meyers, Walter E. Foley, Emil Wanatt, Joe Hayden, T. E. Buecher, A. J. Chittenden, J. L. Ambrose, Joe Cat, Leo Mauch, W. H. Russ, Albert Breedlove, Louis Bolmerman, L. S. McIntosh, O. Word, William A. Woelfel, Jacob Kasterer, George Bertram, Phillip Neidig, William Neidig, William Fritsch, Alexander Schaefer, Roscoe Baker, Oscar Slade, William Maarberg, O. K. Tichenor, Norman Enrus, John P. Alt, S. R. Carter, Frank Busmann, J. Foley, Frank Bender, Mike McKener, Eugene Bollington, Ed. Herschelmann, Emil Koester, Anthony Patry, Arthur Becker, William Gabert, George Smith, W. R. Schmitt, J. M. Lewis, William H. Swatts, Ed. F. Schlamp, Carl Wollweg, Charles Taylor, Rufus Gill, Don Purtle, Taylor Selby, Lawrence Ramsey, Louis Wimberg, Arthus Schwambach, Lester Allen, Edw. L. Ebmeier, William Grubb, Adam Rennler, and Charles Ebmeier, of Evansville, Ind., protesting against the passage of Randall mail-exclusion bill, Bankhead mail-exclusion bill, Sheppard District prohibition bill, Webb nation-wide prohibition bill, and Howard bill to prohibit commerce in intoxicating liquors between the States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Jim McSimore, Jud Thatcher, Jim Holbright, M. Weishoff, Henry Danter, Andrew J. Sartore, Edmund Winiger, Theodore Hayns, Conrad Seibert, John J. Seibert, Jacob Fink, Joseph Wolfe, Henry Salzman, John Reimann, Joseph Schneider, George Schneider, A. C. Schneider, A. Wittman, Frank Wargel, Martin Kuebel, George Lindenschmidt, Louis Herimann, Peter Molinet, August Winiger, Ray Woerz, F. E. Hewins, S. Hallman, W. O. Birkenbusch, John Heiskoj, William Anders, Gus Pelz, Jesse Elbert, Frank Ketzinger, C. A. Lefler, William Fisher, George Bonenberger, Carl Scott, C. C. Hopkins, G. Hayden, A. J. Skelton, R. R. Sisler, C. P. White, Fred Kiechle, E. E. Ellis, E. L. Bullard, J. G. Kaiser, Elmer Wilder, J. C. Nezelles, A. Zumer, E. W. Hodson, Joe Broshears, Martin Enig, jr., John L. Schulze, William Schulze, Aug. Westerhoff, Peter Thullney, William Chasnelle, Edward Pfister, Fred Picker, Claude Riggslee, Adam Weiss, Robert Johnson, George Rapp, Michael Rapp, Charles Ertel, August Keister, John Constance, C. Wilson, Carl W. Schack, G. W. Hur, Fred Krietenstein, J. L. Rhamberlin, George Turner, John W. Schenk, Ed. Heinrich, George Wilson, Otto Kanzler, Ora M. Sansom, Charles A. Hahn, John Folz, Ferd Becker, James Mongham, Frank Melton, John B. Fink, Sam Sitzman, Charles Belleke, Ed. Parker, Henry A. Wolf, Fred J. Bergdolt, Edwin Turner, John Zimmermann, R. P. Sirwell, R. D. Purdue, Henry Ellis, jr., J. G. Daniel, A. J. Payne, Fred Schneider, Ben Marigold, Charles Dirch, Frank Garvey, Henry Sartore, Philip Wurster, Robert Johnson, L. H. Mills, Edw. A. Anstinger, A. J. Bayner, William Meinst, William Wempel, F. Hafendorfer, F. Laurenzo, P. E. Scheller, C. Struchen, William Brune, Arthur Wiechel, Ed. Breedlove, Lois Feiger, Abe Smith, John Schneider, William J. Doerr, John E. Cummins, Frank J. Diehl, William Davant, Charles P. Benter, G. W. Parsley, and Albert Heatherington, of Evansville, Ind., protesting against the passage of Randall mail-exclusion bill, Bankhead mail-exclusion bill, Sheppard District prohibition bill, Webb nation-wide prohibition bill, and Howard bill to prohibit commerce in intoxicating liquors between the States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of Taylor Rodgers, J. George Diehl, Joseph C. Diehl, Jacob G. Diehl, B. H. Diehl, G. H. Mather, Henry Kieff, jr., Edward Yates, August J. Diehl, H. D. Schmitt, Peter Klingler, Thaddeus Koewler, William Noelke, Anton J. Forche, Joseph Urban, August Schhab, E. W. Scholz, Henry V. Muensterman, William Massmer, N. Broshears, Albert Weasel, Adam Schmidt, George Schoweberkler, Anton J. Hoessel, Theodore Maschada, Jake Hahn, Ernest Forche, Frank J. Stoffett, Peter Niehaus, P. J. Rollett, T. C. Eiffer, Charles Green, Fred J. Koreselly, James C. Goody, Oscar Meyer, Herman O. Reidenbach, Edward Bergintz, T. E. Epley, Jim Bluff, Henry Fetz, George Kuebler, W. F. Wunderlich, H. Kramer, Robert Beck, U. P. Schmitt, Henry Dickant, William Dickant, Charles F. Forster, Adolf Bahn, Severin Kempf, Louis Froelich, George Denken, Albert Glerchman, William Schaefer, Gus Weising, Frank Lapp, Henry W. May, A. M. Barthel, J. J. Haffner, Ed. J. Saner, Fred Otto R. Thunbach, Benjamin J. Schuttler, Henry Bruning, V. Schon, William Reich, Robert Schneisen, Charles Krauren, P. Paul Schartz, W. Emerich, J. Neth, A. Schen, Ernest Doerhe, Frank Boyer, Jacob W. Freclish, Paul Kattofen, Henry Boos, Carl Demgransky, Waschil Flinger, Karl Schatz, William M. Hauser, I. E. Riechmann, George Miller, Albert C. Gronothe, Melbin A. Hodgkins, Leo Beckrey, Edward Ebelman,

Joseph A. Folz, Herman Therber, Louis Kauowely, Peter Klantz, William J. Abigt, Henry Roab, Frank C. Schuler, Henry Ruhmeier, Charles Tremers, Frank Sachs, Ham Schaefer, J. Rumpf, John J. Manning, D. J. Murphy, George Peters, Goldia Boyd, F. L. Schmitz, Thomas Matthews, Ollie Humes, Charles Bunder, Richard Peake, Phil Stinson, Thomas M. Britton, William Schneider, Herbert Cook, George W. Cox, Allen T. Wright, Lewis R. Geiss, R. Ingram, C. L. Meadow, Harry Henn, William Hite, John E. Polhins, B. Goodman, Boyde Jones, Ellis E. Vowels, Victor Hubbard, L. Wagner, Charles Byers, Charles Snowball, Albert Gumbel, R. L. Pesch, John Stratmore, Valentine Hoener, V. Sundermann, Frank Lemcke, Otto Moers, John Grimm, Louis Reuter, John A. Holler, Henry Fox, Emil H. Rohnn, and George Haffel, of Evansville, Ind., protesting against the passage of Randall mail-exclusion bill, Bankhead mail-exclusion bill, Sheppard District prohibition bill, Webb Nation-wide prohibition bill, and Howard bill to prohibit commerce in intoxicating liquors between the States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of E. Leat, Bob Schwana, Frank Gray, Moses S. Langley, James Mitchell, John E. Hildebrandt, George P. Allen, A. H. Bredenkamp, Val Kramer, Charles Fhoenbachler, Adam Kunz, Jacob Kunz, P. D. Drain, Louis Ernst, George J. Vogel, Charles B. Keil, Otto Dum, jr., F. J. Haas, Henry Gasper, Elmer Strasser, G. Powers, Frank Blend, Comas Blend, Joseph Bender, John F. Kissinger, Henry Holtz, Walter McCleary, George R. Geleus, Frank Dulling, R. E. Scully, I. L. Miller, Roy Durre, Charles Bundy, William Hobell, Martin Lanil, D. J. Henson, Oscar Seiffer, Ed. Euler, Edgar Durre, Fred Sunderman, Ferd Brown, Ralph Stevens, Adolph Wingert, Abe Levi, Charles Raben, Louis Condredt, Joseph Ansem, Joseph Maas, Louis Raben, George Edwards, Henry Schneider, R. H. Beatly, Edw. Raston, Floyd Queen, Frabj Diehl, William Darant, Charles P. Becker, G. W. Pursley, A. Heallington, Taylor Rodgers, J. George Diehl, Joseph G. Diehl, Jacob G. Diehl, B. H. Diehl, James H. Mathes, Henry Kirpf, jr., Edw. Yates, August J. Diehl, A. D. Schulte, E. H. Rahu, William Cavins, Jacob Highholder, John L. Shipp, C. A. Low, Wesley Falls, August Grotius, Julius Kastatter, Otto Scheel, H. Baertuh, Emil Rahm, William A. Fritsch, William Gotta, G. Wolf, Louis Bauer, Henry Rosenthal, F. M. Lauenstein, C. R. Kiener, Ed. Rommel, John W. Wimberg, H. F. Gruemenger, F. A. Schoeny, B. Steinhauer, A. M. Fisher, Franz Walter, John J. Ehrhardt, John L. Fitzsimmons, Gus. F. Ebert, Roland C. Stern, Henry C. Ries, Otis Potter, Elmer Schoeber, Paul B. Goss, George Swaton, I. G. Burton, Charles F. Elker, A. Wentue, George Emmelto, Albert Wandus, A. E. Kramer, L. J. Perrin, A. Carnegie, A. J. Fehn, J. Keely, M. S. Bettog, Leo Seligman, M. M. Walters, Tousspepe Rimondo, Doe Bowers, W. D. Beever, Frank Niet-hamee, John J. Ehrhardt, John L. Fitzsimmons, Gus. H. Ehrt, Roland Steen, Julius A. Drahem, John Walker, W. J. E. Walker, Leo Cissell, and V. E. Erickson, of Evansville, Ind., protesting against the passage of Randall mail-exclusion bill, Bankhead mail-exclusion bill, Sheppard District prohibition bill, Webb nation-wide prohibition bill, and Howard bill to prohibit commerce in intoxicating liquors between the States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of George C. Wellinger, Charles E. Myers, C. M. Zalhus, E. V. Alexander, J. Crail, Ray Curry, Fred Linder, Elmer Eisenbath, W. A. Whetsell, R. Steinmetz, L. P. Kirch, R. W. Johnson, M. J. Joyce, H. F. Hubbard, John E. Lynch, G. W. Butler, P. H. Riede, W. J. Palmer, L. H. Carle, U. S. G. Curless, M. F. Hanley, P. E. Lawler, F. E. Theobald, George W. Neff, C. A. Wetzel, P. Rattery, O. C. Robinson, James Gorman, William S. Alexander, Oscar Mace, James M. Gahey, L. S. Dreyor, S. H. Sontes, S. Donnelly, P. J. Tarry, W. E. Murphy, Ira W. Eckelberger, Bert O. Sherrill, Thomas H. Gibson, F. W. Hergt, A. J. Lee, Bart Kavanagh, R. J. Neely, G. D. Ashley, C. A. Clamon, A. Connelly, J. S. Reno, F. W. Dennie, W. W. Shartle, J. O. Fly, Charles H. Night, J. T. Ellis, J. J. Moore, F. H. Hurt, employees of the Bureau of Animal Industry, United States Department of Agriculture, residing in the State of Indiana, urging passage of House bill 16060; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MAGEE (by request): Petition of citizens of Syracuse, N. Y., in re House bill 8986, Senate bills 4429 and 1082, House joint resolution 84, and House bill 17850; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MANN: Petition of eight Lithuanian societies, of Roseland, Ill., favoring an embargo on food products, etc.; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. MEEKER: Petitions of Colcord-Wright Machinery & Supply Co., Moloney Electric Co., and Fred Messmer Manufacturing Co., of St. Louis, Mo.; also Larned, Carter & Co., of Detroit, Mich., in favor of 1-cent drop-letter postage; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

Also, petitions of the Woman's Benefit Association of the Maccabees; Loyal Order of Moose, Lodge No. 3; Fraternal Order of Eagles; and Frank B. Nuderscher, all of St. Louis, Mo.; also editor Southern Engineer, editor Cotton, editor Iron Tradesman, and editor Machinery and Supply Buyer, all of Atlanta, Ga.; also New York State Federation of Labor, of Utica, N. Y.; the Woman's Benefit Association of Maccabees, of Port Huron, Mich.; and Union Label Trades Department of the American Federation of Labor, of Washington, D. C., all protesting against the zone bill; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. NEELY: Petitions of various persons residing in the first congressional district of West Virginia, urging a higher rate of compensation for rural mail carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. OAKLEY: Petition of Local Union No. 35, International Union of Brewery Workers, of Hartford, Conn., opposing all mail-exclusion and prohibition laws; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, petition of citizens of New Britain, Conn., opposing the passage of mail-exclusion and prohibition bills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

Also, memorial of Hartford (Conn.) Chamber of Commerce, advocating universal compulsory training for young men; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, memorial of Hartford (Conn.) Chamber of Commerce, favoring unification of Federal and State regulation of railroads; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. ROWE: Memorial of American Federation of Teachers, opposing amendment to section 6 of House bill 19119; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

Also, memorial of International Union of the United Brewery Workmen, in re conditions of Government employees; to the Committee on Appropriations.

Also, memorial of the Lincoln Society, of Brooklyn, N. Y., in favor of compulsory universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

By Mr. SANFORD: Memorial of Albany (N. Y.) Chamber of Commerce, favoring universal military training; to the Committee on Military Affairs.

Also, petition of citizens of Albany, N. Y., protesting against prohibition bills; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SHALENBERGER: Petition of 29 citizens of Nuckolls County, Nebr., for a Christian amendment to the Constitution; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. SLOAN: Thirty-six petitions for increase in salaries and method of pay of rural carriers; to the Committee on the Post Office and Post Roads.

By Mr. SMITH of Michigan: Papers to accompany House bill 20033, for relief of Clarion D. Smith; to the Committee on Pensions.

By Mr. STEENERSON: Protest of A. E. Babcock, editor Bronson Budget, Bronson, Minn., against the enactment of House bill 8348; to the Committee on the District of Columbia.

By Mr. TAGUE: Petition of customs district of Massachusetts, favoring salary increases; to the Committee on Appropriations.

By Mr. TINKHAM: Memorial of Boston Council of the Friends of Irish Freedom, of Boston, Mass., in re foreign conditions; to the Committee on Foreign Affairs.

SENATE.

SATURDAY, January 13, 1917.

The Chaplain, Rev. Forrest J. Prettyman, D. D., offered the following prayer:

Almighty God, we come with reverence before Thee and call upon Thy name and ask Thy blessing, for Thou art the governor of all nations, Thou art the judge of all men. Thou hast revealed Thy will to men. The revelation of Thy will is the path of human progress and blessing and happiness. Help us to conform our lives to Thy will and so work out the problems of State as that our land in its national life may be a transcript of the Divine revelation. For Christ's sake. Amen.

NAMING A PRESIDING OFFICER.

The Secretary (James M. Baker) read the following communication:

UNITED STATES SENATE,
PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE,
Washington, D. C., January 13, 1917.

To the Senate:

Being temporarily absent from the Senate, I appoint Hon. JOSEPH T. ROBINSON, a Senator from the State of Arkansas, to perform the duties of the Chair during my absence.

WILLARD SAULSBURY,
President pro tempore.